
Part XII

Public Facility Element

San Diego County General Plan

Adopted
March 13, 1991
GPA 90-FE
Amended
October 28, 1993
GPA 92-04

Section 1 – Introduction	XII-1-1
Section 2 – Coordination Among Facility Planning, Financing Programs and Land Use Planning	XII-2-1
Section 3 – Parks and Recreation.....	XII-3-1
Section 4 – Transportation.....	XII-4-1
Section 5 – Flood Control.....	XII-5-1
Section 6 – Solid Waste	XII-6-1
Section 7 – Law Enforcement	XII-7-1
Section 8 – Animal Control.....	XII-8-1
Section 9 – Libraries	XII-9-1
Section 10 – Schools	XII-10-1
Section 11 – Fire Protection and Emergency Services	XII-11-1
Section 12 – Wastewater	XII-12-1
Section 13 – Water Provision Systems.....	XII-13-1
Section 14 – Child Care	XII-14-1
Section 15 – Courts and Jails	XII-15-1
Section 16 – Social Services.....	XII-16-1
Section 17 – Health	XII-17-1
Section 18 – Senior Services	XII-18-1
Section 19 – County Administration	XII-19-1
Section 20 – Facilities Located in City Spheres.....	XII-20-1

This Element was partially funded through the Community Development Block Grant program

CERTIFICATE OF ADOPTION

I hereby certify that this is the text of the **Public Facility Element** Section I, Part XII of the **San Diego County General Plan**, as amended by General Plan Amendment (GPA) 92-04, and that it was considered by the San Diego County Planning Commission on the 15th day of October, 1993.

David B. Kreitzer, Chairman

Attest: Lauren M. Wasserman, Secretary

I hereby certify that this is the text of the **Public Facility Element** Section I, Part XII of the **San Diego County General Plan**, as amended by General Plan Amendment (GPA) 92-04, and that it was approved by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors on the 28th day of October 1993.

Brian P. Bilbray, Chairman

Attest: Thomas J. Pastuszka
Clerk of the Board

Adopted March 13, 1991, as part of GPA 90-FE
First Amendment June 10, 1992, as part of GPA 92-FE 1
Second Amendment October 28, 1993, as part of GPA 92-04

A history of the amendments to this Plan is available at the Department of Planning and Land Use.

PUBLIC FACILITY ELEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	XII-1-1
2.	Coordination Among Facility Planning, Financing Programs and Land Use Planning.....	XII-2-1
3.	Parks and Recreation.....	XII-3-1
4.	Transportation.....	XII-4-1
5.	Flood Control.....	XII-5-1
6.	Solid Waste.....	XII-6-1
7.	Law Enforcement.....	XII-7-1
8.	Animal Control.....	XII-8-1
9.	Libraries.....	XII-9-1
10.	Schools.....	XII-10-1
11.	Fire Protection and Emergency Services.....	XII-11-1
12.	Wastewater.....	XII-12-1
13.	Water Provision Systems.....	XII-13-1
14.	Child Care.....	XII-14-1
15.	Courts and Jails.....	XII-15-1
16.	Social Services.....	XII-16-1
17.	Health.....	XII-17-1
18.	Senior Services.....	XII-18-1
19.	County Administration.....	XII-19-1
20.	Facilities Located in City Spheres.....	XII-20-1

PUBLIC FACILITY ELEMENT

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3-1 Local Parks in the Unincorporated Area in 1990.....	XII-3-6
3-2 County Regional Parks in 1990.....	XII-3-7
3-3 County Regional Preserves, Regional Reserves, Open Space Parks and Historic Sites in 1990.....	XII-3-9
4-1 San Diego County Transit Service FY 1989-90.....	XII-4-6
4-2 County Owned Aviation Facilities in 1989.....	XII-4-10
7-1 Service Areas of Sheriff Stations.....	XII-7-3
7-2 Law Enforcement Support Bureau Facilities and Services Provided.....	XII-7-4
9-1 1990 County Library Facility Deficiencies Based on Goal Facility Levels.....	XII-9-4
10-1 School Districts Serving the San Diego Region in 1990.....	XII-10-4
11-1 Fire Protection Agencies Serving the Unincorporated Area in 1990.....	XII-11-2
12-1 Agencies Providing Sewer Service to the Unincorporated Area in 1990.....	XII-12-2
12-2 Agencies Serving the Unincorporated Area Undertaking Water Reclamation in 1990.....	XII-12-9
13-1 San Diego County Water Authority Member Agencies in 1990.....	XII-13-4
13-2 Classification of Water Agencies.....	XII-13-6
13-3 Water Conveyance Facilities Serving the San Diego Region in 1990.....	XII-13-8
13-4 Major Local Water Storage Facilities Located in the San Diego Region in 1990.....	XII-13-10
13-5 Water Districts and Other Public Agencies Not Members of the County Water Authority in 1990.....	XII-13-12
14-1 School Districts Serving the Unincorporated Area Providing Facilities for Before and After School Care in 1990.....	XII-14-3
14-2 1989 Estimated Demand for Child Care Spaces in the Unincorporated Area and the San Diego Region.....	XII-14-4
14-3 1989 Estimated Supply of Licensed Child Care Spaces in the San Diego Region.....	XII-14-5
15-1 County Operated Detention Facilities in 1990.....	XII-15-2
15-2 Facilities Containing County Operated Courtrooms/ Hearing Rooms in 1989.....	XII-15-5
19-1 Locations of County Administrative & Support Functions in 1990.....	XII-19-2

PUBLIC FACILITY ELEMENT

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
3-A	Local Parks Serving the Unincorporated Area	XII-3-3
3-B	County Regional Parks	XII-3-4
4-A	Transportation Support Facilities.....	XII-4-4
4-B	Transit Centers.....	XII-4-8
4-C	County Aviation Facilities.....	XII-4-9
5-A	Flood Control Facilities and Mapped Flood Plains...	XII-5-3
6-A	Solid Waste Disposal Facilities.....	XII-6-2
7-A	Sheriff Facilities.....	XII-7-2
8-A	Animal Control Facilities.....	XII-8-2
9-A	County Library Facilities.....	XII-9-2
10-A	Elementary School Districts.....	XII-10-2
10-B	High School Districts.....	XII-10-3
11-A	Fire Protection District Facilities.....	XII-11-6
12-A	Location of Public Wastewater Treatment Facilities.....	XII-12-3
12-B	Cities and Districts Providing Sewer Service.....	XII-12-4
13-A	Groundwater Dependent Areas.....	XII-13-2
13-B	Cities and Special Districts Providing Water Service.....	XII-13-5
13-C	Water Facilities.....	XII-13-9
15-A	County Court and Jail Facilities.....	XII-15-3
16-A	Social Services Facilities.....	XII-16-3
17-A	County Owned Health Facilities.....	XII-17-2
18-A	Adult Day Care Facilities and Senior Centers.....	XII-18-2
18-B	Senior Nutrition Facilities.....	XII-18-3
19-A	Major County Administration Facilities.....	XII-19-3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PREPARATION OF THIS ELEMENT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE WITHOUT THE SPIRITED PARTICIPATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MANY OF THE SPECIAL DISTRICTS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COUNTY STAFF. STAFF THROUGHOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE AND FROM OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS GAVE INVALUABLE ADVICE AND INPUT.

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATED ON WORKING COMMITTEES:

FIRE DISTRICT WORKING COMMITTEE

Chief William Barker, Elfin Forest CSA #107
Chief Karl Diekman, Ramona Municipal Water District
Chief Darrell Jobes, Bostonia Fire Protection District
Chief Barritt Neal, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Chief Arden Pederson, Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District
Chief Andy Vanderlaan, North County Fire Protection District
Chief Orville Williamson, San Miguel Fire Protection District

SCHOOL DISTRICT WORKING COMMITTEE

Judy Endeman, Ramona School District
Jack Kriege, Grossmont Union High School
Alicia Kroese, Poway Unified School District
Wayne Oetkin, Cajon Valley School District
Jeff Okun, San Marcos Unified School District
Kate Shurson, Chula Vista City School District
Thomas Silva, Sweetwater Union High School District
Lucy Gross, Leona Hone and Tom Robinson, County Office of Education

SEWER DISTRICT WORKING COMMITTEE

Gary Arant, Valley Center Municipal Water District
Gary Decker, Otay Water District
Rafael Munoz, County Department of Public Works, Liquid Waste
John Perry, Rainbow Municipal Water District
Benton C. Price, Fallbrook Sanitary District
Ken Thompson, Ramona Municipal Water District

WATER DISTRICT WORKING COMMITTEE

Frederick Adjarian, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District
Gary Arant, Valley Center Municipal Water District

Byron Buck and Chuck Rhodes, County Water Authority
Don Kaiser, Helix Water District
Vern Leming, Former Chairman, Ramona Municipal Water District
Roland Rossmiller, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Thomas Wilson, Vista Irrigation District

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CITY MANAGERS ASSOCIATION

Ray Patchett, City Manager, City of Carlsbad
Morris Vance, City Manager, City of Vista
Doug Clark, City Manager, City of Escondido

CHILD CARE WORKING COMMITTEE

Doris Bloomberg, San Diego Family Day Care Association
Mary Delany, Care-nection, Inc.
Deborah Eaton, San Diego Unified School District
Helena Hyman, Care-nection, Inc.
Sue Manglallan, County Farm and Home Advisor
Candace McCay, San Diego Unified School District
Diana Mottershaw, Labor's Community Service Agency
Gerlinde Topzand, Salvation Army Learning Center/County Child Care Coordinator
Panzly Wade, Neighborhood House Head Start
Jean Brunkow, Ruai Crawford, Jenna Jardin, Child Care Resource Service

**COUNTY STAFF THAT ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE
ELEMENT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:**

Chief Administrative Office

Norman W. Hickey, Chief Administrative Officer
Lari Sheehan, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Department of Animal Control

Sally Hazzard, Director
Barbara Torres
Robert Salinardo

Area Agency on Aging

Daniel L. Laver, Director
Joaquin Anguera, Deputy Director

County Counsel

Lloyd Harmon, County Counsel
Bill Smith, Deputy County Counsel

Department of General Services

Jane Huston, Director
Clarence Kaufman

Department of Health Services

J. William Cox, Director
Gary Stephany, Deputy Director
Steve Allee, Environmental Health Services
Kathleen M. Armogida, Planning, Policy and Development
Mike Devine, Environmental Health Services
Howard DeYoung, Physical Health Services
Steve Eldred, Office of AIDS Coordination

Department of Health Services (continued)

Joan Friedenbergh, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services
Victoria Gallagher, Hazardous Materials Management
Chris Gonaver, Hazardous Material Management
Bob Hutchinson, Management Services
Bob Haebel, Public Health Services
John Ma, Environmental Health Services
Don Peters, Planning, Policy and Development
Peggy Smith, Mental Health Services
Laura Tamayo, Hazardous Materials Management

County Library

Catherine Lucas, County Librarian
Debra Miller, Assistant County Librarian
Barbara Loomis

Department of Parks and Recreation

Bob Copper, Director
Alex Martinez, Assistant Director
Linda Zombeck
Rod Barrette

Department of Planning and Land Use

Lauren M. Wasserman, Director
Gerald J. Jamriska, AICP, Assistant Director
Gerald Hermanson, Deputy Director

Joan Werner, Chief, Facilities Planning
Theresa Cherniak, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Matt Bohan, Facilities Planning
Denise Doran, Administration
Thora Feeley, Administration
Rey Hernandez, Graphics
Kevin Karaffa, Facilities Planning
John Peterson, Groundwater Geologist
Ron Poblete, Graphics
David Rees, Facilities Planning
Herm Rosenthal, Transportation Planning
Sally Shafer-Finch, Transportation Planning
Joshua Wolfe, AICP, Facilities Planning
Susan Vaughn, Administration

Department of Public Works

Granville Bowman, Director
John Burke, Deputy Director
Richard Anthony, Solid Waste
Noreen Crane, Airports
Patricia Ferrand, Solid Waste
Karel Hansen, Land Development (Bikeways)
Joe Hill, Flood Control
Bill Hoebe, Land Development (Transportation/Roads)
Kathy Lehtola, Solid Waste

Department of Public Works (continued)

Jim Magee, Solid Waste
Ralph Munoz, Liquid Waste
Dwight Smith, Liquid Waste
Bill Spalding, Flood Control
Eric Swanson, Solid Waste
Larry Watt, Transit Centers (Bus and Trolley)

Sheriff's Department

Jim Roache, Sheriff
Ray Cummings

Department of Social Services

Richard W. Jacobsen, Director
Nancy Hoskins
Caron Johnson

Office of Special Projects

Richard Robinson, Manager

Peggy Goldstein

Chuck Pennell

Nick Marinovich

George Ream

In addition, many other staff members from various departments reviewed portions of the drafts and made valuable contributions.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The Public Facility Element, one of twelve Countywide Elements of the San Diego County General Plan, sets forth the County's long range public facility program. Its aim is to ensure a strong linkage between public facility planning and land use planning. From 1986 to 1990, the population of the unincorporated area grew at an estimated average rate of 17,000 per year, and the population of the region at 86,000 per year. With this rate of population increase, it is imperative that public facilities are available to serve both the existing and new population and that public facility planning remains an integral part of the land use decisionmaking process.

Without public infrastructure systems, our society would be unable to function. The County's extensive system of roads and thoroughfares allows for the transport of goods and people and affects the economic vitality of the region. Fire stations, animal control shelters, sheriff stations, courts, jails, water lines, flood control improvements, solid waste disposal sites and wastewater treatment plants ensure the protection and safety of the public. Schools ensure that our society will continue to educate the next generation. Quality of life and the health and welfare of County residents are furthered by parks and recreation facilities, senior centers, child care centers, libraries, health facilities and social services facilities. These public facilities are provided by a wide variety of public and private entities, including the County, special districts, joint powers agencies, regional authorities and private individuals and organizations. The network of public facilities provides the backbone of the County's economy, safety and quality of life.

The aim of this Element is to ensure that the facilities needs of the County's communities are adequately considered in all County actions, and to encourage a regional approach to public facility planning and funding. This Element addresses both the issue of facility provision for new development, and the adequacy of public facilities for current residents. In the past, facilities planning has not always played a prominent role in land development decisions, resulting in facility provision difficulties and in facilities deficiencies. The provisions of this Element are aimed at avoiding this in the future, and ensuring that new development does not degrade the current level of facilities. As the region continues to grow, regional solutions to these difficulties become more and more necessary.

BACKGROUND

In November 1988, the County Board of Supervisors accepted the final report of the Regional Growth and Planning Review Task Force. This report contained a growth

management strategy for the San Diego region that included a number of recommendations aimed at improving the quality of life in the San Diego region. One of the major factors affecting quality of life is the availability of public facilities needed to serve the rapidly increasing population of the region. A public opinion poll commissioned for the Task Force in 1987¹ indicated a public desire for government and developers to ensure the funding of essential public facilities and to phase construction to meet the public's need for public facilities. This Element is an outgrowth of these recommendations, and addresses the issues of the adequacy and availability of needed public facilities prior to approval of land development projects.

In November 1988, the voters of the region approved Proposition C, the Regional Planning and Growth Control Measure. Through the approval of this measure, the public indicated its support for formulation of a regional growth management plan to resolve problems and establish guidelines for regional growth issues, including the provision and funding of regional facilities. This Element is complementary to the efforts of the Regional Board by including programs to coordinate with the cities and other agencies on solutions to regional facility planning problems.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC FACILITY ELEMENT

The Public Facility Element sets forth a comprehensive strategy for the planning, siting, and funding of public facilities necessary to meet San Diego County's existing and future demands. The Element provides an integrated framework of public facility goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures incorporating the County's expectations and requirements to ensure the effective and efficient provision of public facilities concurrent with need. These provisions will serve to guide and direct local land use decisionmaking.

The Element is also designed to foster coordination with local, regional, state and federal agencies. It contains measures to enhance cooperation among facility-providing agencies and land use jurisdictions to ensure that land use decisions take into account the provision of public facilities. Problems impeding effective planning, construction or management of public facilities in the County are identified and addressed.

The Element is unique because it comprehensively addresses the complex facility provision system in the County, and includes the full range of public facilities serving and being impacted by new development, including both local and regional facilities. The Element covers a comprehensive list of facility types, including: wastewater, water provision, fire protection and emergency services, schools, flood control, transportation, parks and recreation, law enforcement, animal control, libraries, solid waste, hazardous

¹ Analysis Research Limited for the San Diego Association of Governments, A Survey of San Diego County Residents Concerning Population Growth Issues (San Diego, CA: Analysis Research Limited, February, 1987)

waste, child care, courts and jails, health, social services, senior services, and general county administrative facilities. Additionally, this Element contains a section devoted to facility planning within unincorporated areas that are expected to annex to cities (spheres of influence).

The County fulfills a dual role as both a provider of local services to the unincorporated area, and as the provider of regional services to the entire County. Consequently, this Element addresses facilities policies that affect areas not within the County's land use jurisdiction. For these facility types, e.g., courts and jails, social services, health, senior services, and solid waste, many of the policies involve coordination and cooperation with the region's cities on facilities planning, siting and funding.

Because this Element addresses facilities provided by the County and other agencies throughout the entire unincorporated area, and in some cases throughout the region, its provisions are broad, and allow communities and individual service providers the latitude necessary to determine the most appropriate ways to provide sufficient public facilities. The Public Facility Element lays the foundation for comprehensive facility planning at the community or subregional level, and for capital facility financing plans for equitable financing methods at the regional, subregional, community and project-level to meet the needs of existing and planned developments.

PUBLIC FACILITY ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The Element will be implemented through:

- (1) Amendment, development and adoption of ordinances, Board of Supervisors policies and other County regulations.
- (2) Application of the Element's goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures to the review and conditional approval or denial of discretionary land use projects. This process will be carried out in conjunction with the review of projects for consistency with this Element and the other Elements of the General Plan.
- (3) Development of public facility components of community and subregional plans during the plan update process. This Element serves as a framework for the community and subregional plan update process, where the facilities needs of individual communities will be specifically identified through consultation with community members and the service providers. This process will closely tie facilities planning to the individual land use plans of each community, and will address the planning, timing, siting and funding for specific facility needs.

- (4) Adoption of financing methods to obtain needed public facilities, including development impact fees, assessment districts, and other means to obtain equitable contributions from both existing and planned development to meet facility objectives.
- (5) Conducting specified studies, plans, legislative policy advocacy and other special measures identified in the Element.
- (6) Development and enhancement of processes for coordination, consultation, and cooperation with special districts, cities, and regional bodies.
- (7) Review of public facility projects for conformance to the County General Plan.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The County General Plan establishes the County's land use planning and resource protection policies through a number of interrelated and complementary Elements. State law mandates that all Elements of the General Plan be internally consistent. The Public Facility Element is complementary to and consistent with all Elements of the County General Plan, and supplements the policies of the following Elements with relation to the provision of public facilities: Regional Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Housing, Open Space, Public Safety, and Recreation.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE REGIONAL LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN AND COMMUNITY/SUBREGIONAL PLANS

The Regional Land Use Element designates the distribution, location, type and extent of land uses in the County. Community and Subregional Plans designate in more detail the location, type, density and intensity of land uses within their areas, as well as establishing land use goals and policies particular to the area covered by the plans. The physical development and land use pattern of the County is directly impacted by, and has impacts on, public facilities.

To ensure that development occurs in an orderly and timely fashion, sufficient public facilities must be available concurrent with need. The Regional Land Use Element contains a number of overall public facilities goals and objectives which include the efficient, economical, equitable and timely provision of public facilities; the phasing of growth with facilities; and the coordination of facilities planning. Each individual Community or Subregional Plan may expand on these goals and objectives and tailor them to particular community needs. The Public Facility Element does not establish appropriate land uses, but ensures that the land uses established in the Regional Land Use Element and the Community and Subregional Plans will be supported by

appropriate public facilities prior to development occurring.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROVISION OF FACILITIES AND ONGOING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

This Element focuses on the provision of public facilities. The operations and maintenance of these facilities have not been directly addressed in this Element, although the ability to fund operations and maintenance costs may affect the County's or facility provider's timing on construction of the facilities. This relationship exists for all service providers, in large part because constitutional limitations on the revenues of service-providing agencies have severely constrained available funding. The magnitude of this funding shortage calls for statewide solutions that are beyond the scope of this Element.

If funding is not available for operations and maintenance, facilities cannot be properly expanded to meet community needs. For many facility types, facilities cannot be developed or constructed until a means is established to fund operations and maintenance costs. In implementing the Element, service providers will have to consider their obligations to fund operations and maintenance as well as their commitment to meet the goals and objectives contained in this Element.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ELEMENT

The Public Facility Element is organized into 20 Sections. This first introductory section provides background information, establishes the purpose and scope of the Element, and describes its relationship to other Elements of the County General Plan. The second section sets forth the County's overall public facilities and financing goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures which apply to all facility types.

Sections 3 through 19 describe the eighteen facility types addressed by this Element, and establish the County's goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures for each. Section 20 discusses the special planning needs for facilities within city spheres of influence, and establishes goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures for facility planning and financing within these areas.

Sections 3 through 20 are each divided into six sub-sections:

- o **OVERVIEW**, describes the facility type, its purpose, and any mandates for its provision.
- o **EXISTING CONDITIONS**, elaborates on agencies responsible for providing the facilities, the facility provision system, the geographic area the facilities are

provided in, what is provided, and generalized facility locations.

- o **EXISTING FACILITY LEVEL**, describes the extent of facilities being provided in 1990, at the time of adoption of the Element.
- o **FUNDING METHODS**, describes both current and potential sources of facility funding particular to the facility type.
- o **ISSUES**, discusses topics of concern related to the provision of adequate facilities.
- o **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**, establishes County positions on the provision of facilities and establishes a course of actions for the County to take to meet the goal of ensuring adequate levels of facilities.

All figures contained in the Public Facility Element are for informational purposes only and are not adopted as part of this Element. Adopted maps of other Elements, including the Regional Land Use and Circulation Elements, and community and subregional plan maps, provide General Plan policy guidance for implementing public facilities planning.

IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE CODE EXPLANATION

The responsibility for carrying out the policies of this Element does not lie solely with the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU). The cooperation of other County departments, special districts, cities, and numerous other entities both public and private is necessary to make these measures successful.

A code has been placed at the end of each Implementation Measure which identifies it with the County departments that are responsible for carrying out the measure (see below). The first code listed indicates the County department with lead or primary responsibility for implementation, with other departments listed having secondary responsibility in conjunction with the lead department. Many of the Implementation Measures will require cooperation and coordination with other agencies outside of the County. These agencies have not been listed.

This approach can aid staff and the public in charting progress in implementing the plan.

CODE

AAA	Area Agency on Aging
AG	Agriculture, Weights and Measures
CAO	Chief Administrative Office, including the Office of Special Projects
CCC	Child Care Coordinator
DAC	Department of Animal Control
DGS	Department of General Services
DHS	Department of Health Services
DIS	Department of Information Services
DPLU	Department of Planning and Land Use
DPC	Department of Purchasing and Contracting
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DPW	Department of Public Works
DSS	Department of Social Services
DTB	Department of Transborder Affairs
LIB	County Library District
ODP	Office of Disaster Preparedness
OIA	Office of Intergovernmental Affairs
SHE	Sheriff

SECTION 2. COORDINATION OF FACILITY PLANNING, FINANCING PROGRAMS, AND LAND USE PLANNING

OVERVIEW

Many different facilities are needed to support communities and to ensure their livability.

This Element includes individual sections on 18 different facility types considered essential to the proper functioning of the County's communities. San Diego County is comprised of urban and rural communities as well as transitional areas. The needs of these areas vary substantially based on intensity of land use, institutional arrangements, geographic conditions, financial base, and the desires of the community. As a result, this Element establishes broad parameters applicable to all types of circumstances found throughout the unincorporated area.

In order to ensure that facilities are available when needed, and that development does not proceed until facilities are available, it is essential that facility planning by all service providers be coordinated with land use planning and development. The diversity of service providers makes effective coordination more difficult to achieve, but it also makes communication imperative. Without effective coordination and cooperation, land use decisions may create or exacerbate facility deficiencies that would in turn diminish the quality of life of County residents.

In addition to planning public facilities, financing them is one of the foremost challenges facing public agencies today. The Governor of California's Office of Planning and Research has said: "Paying for public facilities in California just now is a political, legal and philosophical quagmire. It is also absolutely essential."¹

While considerable attention is generally given to paying for public facilities that are necessitated by new development, existing public facility needs must also be addressed. In many areas, current facility levels are inadequate to meet the needs of the present population. These existing deficiencies are, in some cases, critical problems that must be remedied through a commitment of the facility provider and the community. Such deficiencies may be compounded by the addition of new residents; however, funding for these existing needs must come from sources other than new development.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Public facilities within the County are provided by a myriad of agencies at the local, regional, state and federal levels. Within the unincorporated County there are over 250

¹ Office of Planning and Research, Paying the Piper: New Ways to Pay for Public Infrastructure in California (Sacramento, CA: State of California, 1982), p. 1.

special districts, state and federal agencies, cities, and County departments involved in the facility planning process. Providers of individual facility types are detailed in Sections 3 through 20 of this Element.

Public facilities for local services within the unincorporated area are typically provided either by the County, by special districts, or by public entities established through joint powers or similar agreements. Some local services, such as law enforcement, libraries and animal control, are provided by the County to the unincorporated area and to some cities by contract. Alternatively, regional facilities, such as courts and jails and health and social services, are provided by the County and its agents to the entire region, including residents of cities. Most of these regional services are mandated by the State.

Many public facilities in the County are provided by special districts, which are either dependent or independent. Dependent districts are governed by the Board of Supervisors acting as the Board of Directors, whereas independent districts have locally elected Boards of Directors. Special districts are created under the provisions of state law and are authorized to provide facilities and services and to raise and expend funds as delineated in the legislation authorizing their establishment. Actions taken by independent districts for the planning, provision and funding of public facilities are not controlled by the County. Examples of services provided by special district include sewer and water service and fire protection. School districts, though technically not special districts, similarly operate independently of the County government.

ISSUES

1. Detailed facilities planning at the community or subregional level is necessary.

Discussion: The unincorporated County covers an area of 3,627 square miles, and contains over 25 individual and unique communities. Each community has different development patterns, facility/service provision systems, and community desires. Additionally, differing facility levels are appropriate based on the character of the community, and the community's willingness to financially support the construction and operation of facilities. Because of these differences, facilities objectives will vary. Facilities planning must be addressed on a community-by-community basis, taking into account the varying character, desires and needs of individual communities. The plan update process provides a framework for the development of detailed facility and financing components of each community and subregional plan within the broad parameters established in this Element.

2. The adequacy of public facilities to serve new development must be ensured through the land development approval process.

Discussion: A wide variety of public facilities are used by service providers to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public and to enhance the quality of

life. As new development occurs, the ability of existing facilities to adequately serve the community is impacted. The availability of all types of public facilities must be considered during the land development approval process, and assurances must be required that public facilities are or will be available to meet all future demands. A number of facility types have historically been considered during the land development approval process, e.g., wastewater, water, fire, schools, transportation, flood control and parks. However, the full impacts have not necessarily been mitigated in all projects on a consistent basis. For example, regional transportation impacts have often been overlooked. While cumulative impacts are difficult to assess, both the short-term and long-term impacts must be considered.

In addition, new development also affects other facilities, and these impacts have not historically been evaluated during development review. Impacts on facilities such as libraries, animal control, law enforcement, solid and hazardous waste, as well as County regional facilities have not been consistently evaluated, except in cases where the impacts are extreme and apparent. All development, regardless of size, has a cumulative impact on these facilities, and on the level of service provided to current residents. It is essential that equitable mitigation measures be established for all facility types to ensure that new development does not create unmet facility needs.

3. The timing of facilities improvements must be coordinated with the timing of development to the extent possible given the constraints of financing methods.

Discussion: Mechanisms are necessary to ensure that facilities are available at the time that new buildings are occupied or in some cases, sooner. It is difficult in many cases to coordinate the timing of the availability of facilities with new development, particularly in growing areas where incremental additions to the community cause cumulative demands for facilities.

Funding methods sometimes dictate the timing of facilities. When development impact fees are collected at building permit issuance or later, facilities are not likely to be constructed before the private development paying the fee is completed. Additionally, impact fees are of little utility until a sufficient sum has been collected to ensure adequate funds available for a facility. For these reasons, facilities may not actually be provided to all new construction immediately concurrent with need.

Orderly patterns of land use reduce facilities costs and promote service efficiencies. Compact development patterns allow for incremental facilities improvements and are most efficient for the delivery of services. When development occurs in a "leap-frog" manner (where the distance from the proposed development to existing development is great) major extensions of facilities are required and costs rise. Additionally, response times are longer to sparsely populated areas, and service levels in those areas may not be suitable for intensive activities that require public services. Premature extension of services can have growth-inducing impacts and adversely affect provision of other services. The availability of essential services can make it economically or politically attractive for growth to occur in its vicinity. For these reasons, development in areas where facilities are currently provided or can easily be provided is encouraged.

It is essential that public facilities be supportive of land use patterns. Public facilities should not be the impetus for premature development of property, nor should it be the basis for growth control. Ideally, public facilities planning should complement land use planning by making it possible to build the community with the desired character. However, this relationship is, in practice, difficult to achieve. Since the timing of facilities availability is not always ideal to meet the needs of growth, development projects must sometimes be delayed, denied, or conditioned to assure that all essential facilities will be ready to serve the project concurrent with need.

4. Regional planning is required for a number of facilities.

Discussion: The need for many facilities does not stop at city, County or special district boundaries, but extends across these boundaries. Issues such as transportation and flood control require regional or subregional facilities solutions. Some facilities such as law enforcement, fire protection and emergency services are planned as part of a coordinated regional network to maximize mutual reinforcements. Additionally, development in one jurisdiction may have an impact on facilities in another jurisdiction. A mechanism is necessary to develop regional and/or subregional facilities strategies, and to jointly plan and construct these facilities to avoid conflicts and negative impacts on neighboring jurisdictions, as well as to maximize the effective utilization of the region's facility networks.

5. Facilities should be financed by those who benefit from them to the extent reasonable and feasible.

Discussion: Equitable financing methods for public facilities are essential to meet the requirements of State law and to fairly represent the needs and interests

of all members of the community. The design and implementation of facility financing methods should seek an equitable distribution of financial responsibility, including consideration of the nature of the demand and the indirect benefits. The cost of facilities should be allocated between existing deficiencies (to be paid for by the existing population) and the added facilities needed to serve the needs of new development (to be paid for by new development). Within each of these categories, costs should be spread based on benefits received (e.g., a measurement of benefit from fire protection is the amount and type of square footage of the building being protected).

Some basic principles of associating benefit with cost can be applied; for example, a local park will consistently attract its users within a certain distance from the park. In contrast, facilities that are available to all members of the public, such as the regional transportation network, clearly are of a regional benefit and require regional funding methods.

The determination of who benefits from the construction or expansion of facilities is often very complex. Certain facilities such as prisons are used by only a small segment of society, yet their existence benefits all people and all properties throughout the region by incarcerating potentially dangerous individuals. Others such as flood control facilities can more readily be shown to benefit specific properties, but can also be viewed as a benefit to newly developing upstream properties.

There are instances where it may be desirable to subsidize the costs incurred by certain types of development. For example, projects meeting goals to provide low and moderate income housing opportunities may not be able to provide their full fair share of facilities costs and still be feasible as low-cost housing. Other types of land uses may generate offsetting benefits such as economic revitalization of a depressed area or retention of agricultural uses. Exceptions to full fair-share contributions for special purposes may sometimes be warranted.

The development of funding methods must be equitable, but must also be sensitive to other goals of the County General Plan.

6. It is essential in the review of Large Scale Projects that planning the timing and siting of public facilities occurs at the earliest point of discretionary approval in the land development process.

Discussion: Large Scale Projects are private residential projects of over 100 acres in size that meet specified criteria and propose either 300 or more units (in the Current or Future Urban Development Areas) or 50 or more units (in all other General Plan categories.) Commercial or industrial developments or projects that

would have similar impacts as the above residential projects on traffic, adjacent land use, or public facilities are also considered Large Scale Projects.

Such projects, because of their size, place great demands on community public facilities. These projects have the potential for immediate, major impacts on facilities in an area because of the number of lots being created at one time in a concentrated portion of a community. Since approval of a Large Scale Project designates land uses throughout a sizeable acreage, it is often necessary to establish suitable sites for public facilities as part of the Large Scale Project's land planning process.

Integrating the facility planning with the other aspects of planning a Large Scale Project is the only way to ensure proper circulation, access, timing and land use compatibility. To the extent feasible, projects should be conditioned such that the occupancy of structures is tied to the availability of facilities so that large scale developments do not unduly burden the existing facility network of a community.

7. Facility deficiencies currently exist in many areas of the County. These deficiencies must be financed through local means.

Discussion: In some areas, current levels of facilities do not meet those levels considered to be sufficient to serve existing development. These existing deficiencies are, in some cases, critical problems that must be remedied through a commitment of the facility provider and the community. Such deficiencies may be compounded by the addition of new residents creating additional demands; however, funding for these facilities cannot be required from new development.

8. Facilities availability and financing methods have an impact on the availability of affordable housing.

Discussion: The availability of public facilities is a prerequisite to the siting of any housing project. A shortage of facilities may lead to growth restrictions that constrain the housing market and drive prices of existing homes upward. Therefore, the timely availability of public facilities is an important component in meeting the County's goals of providing housing opportunities for all income groups.

However, the increasing reliance on development impact fees can also adversely affect the affordability of housing. In a market such as San Diego where demand is high, the added costs of new construction are, to a great extent, passed on as higher costs of new residential units. The policies on funding facilities must be sensitive to the housing market and the needs of all affected citizens of the region.

9. An equitable share of State funding and a regional method to share the costs of facilities serving the region are needed.

Discussion: Many public facilities, and the services provided in them, are mandated by the State. The State provides partial financial support toward State mandates, particularly for the regional programs such as health and social services. However, State formulas for funding these programs do not always provide sufficient funding for San Diego County to meet State requirements. In some cases the County is risking loss of State accreditation due to the County's inability to improve facilities to meet all of the State's requirements.

Additionally, the needs for many types of facilities are generated by regional service demands. A substantial amount of the costs for facilities serving the entire region are not fully offset by State, Federal or local funding sources. An equitable regional method is needed for sharing the costs of facilities that serve the entire region.

10. Multijurisdictional involvement in the siting of public facilities is needed.

Discussion: The County, cities, special districts, and other service providers are responsible for siting the facilities that they will individually use to provide service. However, there is an increasing recognition in the region of the interrelationships between facilities and among providers, and provision of all types of public facilities are being increasingly well coordinated among providers of like and complementary services. For example, fire districts and cities have mutual aid and automatic response agreements to maximize the use of one another's capabilities. Schools often provide space for public services that are useful to their students. Parks and schools frequently co-locate to increase park usage and to handle maintenance costs.

Furthermore, many County facilities that provide service throughout the region are most appropriately located within the boundaries of cities. Regardless of location these facilities serve the population of the entire region, including residents of cities and the unincorporated area.

In some cases public agencies are required to obtain permits from the land use agency governing that territory; for example, fire stations are subject to County land use approval. In other cases such as water conveyance facilities and the County's regionwide facilities (exclusive of solid waste), it is not legally necessary for the facilities to meet zoning and building regulations of the host land use jurisdiction. Regardless of the legal requirements, it is desirable for all public

agencies to coordinate with one another on the siting of facilities.

In those cases where one public agency applies for permits from another (whether the application is made by choice or due to legal requirements), it is essential that land use approvals be promptly processed, while still ensuring adequate land use and environmental review. Time delays can create added expenses and delays in providing service at time of need. A mechanism including all jurisdictions and facility providers, and participation by local communities, is needed to jointly plan the siting of public facilities and to maximize the potential for co-locating suitable functions.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

SUFFICIENT PUBLIC FACILITIES OF ALL TYPES AVAILABLE CONCURRENT WITH NEED TO SERVE COUNTY RESIDENTS.

GOAL

THE EQUITABLE FUNDING OF ALL NEEDED PUBLIC FACILITIES.

GOAL

COOPERATION AMONG SERVICE PROVIDERS, CITIES AND THE COUNTY TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT PUBLIC FACILITIES IN THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANNER.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Establishment of a framework for coordination between land use planning and capital facilities planning.

Policy 1.1: The County will include public facilities planning and availability as part of decision making on land use and development.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Prepare a public facility and financing

component for each community and subregional plan in cooperation with community representatives and all facility providers. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Use community or subregional plan updates and General Plan Amendments to identify the general location of all proposed public facilities. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Refer general plan amendments, community or subregional plan updates, and rezone applications to service providers to obtain their input on the impact of all proposed changes in the density or intensity of land uses on their ability to provide the service. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Require preparation of a facilities report for General Plan Amendments involving an increase in density or intensity of use that includes an assessment of the availability of the full range of public facilities needed to serve the project, and the plans for the siting, funding and timing of needed facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Notify affected facility providers of land development applications and approvals within their service areas. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.6: Refer development applications requiring any changes to special district or city boundaries (e.g., annexation, detachment, formation), including any environmental determinations on such projects, to LAFCo for review and comment. [DPLU]

Policy 1.2: Encourage facility providing agencies to carry out long range capital facility planning and construction that is compatible with land use planning goals and objectives.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Supply data on land use, population and other issues to facility providers to assist in the preparation of Public Facility Improvement Plans. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Include active participation of all facility providers in the preparation of the public facility and financing component of each community and subregional Plan. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.2.3: Encourage facility providers to base their long range capital facilities planning on the land uses contained in the Regional Land Use Element and applicable community and subregional plans, and on the provisions of this Element. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.2.4: Maintain a data base regarding facilities and facility providers. [DPLU]

Policy 1.3: The County will coordinate planning for the appropriate siting of public facilities with the cities and affected service providers of the region at the earliest possible point in the siting process.

Implementation Measure 1.3.1: Establish a cooperative process among land use jurisdictions and service providers to assure that public facilities are sited in locations that best serve the region's population irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries, while considering city and county general plans, and balancing the regional needs for the facility with environmental impacts and community standards. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.3.2: Adopt a procedure to give priority to the processing of plans for public facilities, and request cities to adopt similar procedures, within the scope of State law and local land use guidelines. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.3.3: Ensure that adopted planning and zoning guidelines do not negatively impact the appropriate siting of public facilities, and request the same of cities. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

The efficient provision of all necessary public facilities concurrent with need for all development projects.

Policy 2.1: Assure that growth is limited to areas where adequate public facilities exist or can be efficiently provided.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Promote the efficient and cost-effective delivery of public facilities and services through the designation of areas for more intensive uses only within or adjacent to areas with adequate public facility capacity. [DPLU]

Policy 2.2: Development projects will be required to provide or fund their fair share of all public facilities needed by the development.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Evaluate the quality and quantity of facilities necessary to serve proposed development projects using County or special district standards, and the goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures of this Element and other Elements of the General Plan. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Refer discretionary development projects, including any proposed site dedications, to the affected service providers for their review and recommendations. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.3: Require, as a basis of approval, discretionary development projects to provide or contribute toward the provision of all public facilities necessary to serve the development concurrent with need. [DPLU]

Policy 2.3: Large Scale Projects will be required to plan for the siting of necessary public facilities and to provide or fund their fair share of all public facility needs created by the development.

Implementation Measure 2.3.1: Require preparation of a facilities report for Large Scale Projects that includes an assessment of the availability of the full range of public facilities needed to serve the project, and the plans for the siting, funding and timing of needed facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.3.2: Refer public facilities reports prepared for Large Scale Projects to the affected service providers for their review and recommendations. If such report indicates any changes to special district or city boundaries (e.g., annexation, detachment, formation), refer the report, including any environmental determination to LAFCo for review and comment. [DPLU].

Implementation Measure 2.3.3: Condition the approval of Large Scale Projects on the dedication or reservation of all appropriate sites for public facilities to serve the development. These locations shall meet the siting requirements contained in this Element and shall be of an appropriate size to serve the project as well as any logical adjoining service areas. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.3.4: Promote the joint siting, planning, development and operation of complementary public functions in the public facilities plans of Large Scale Projects. [DPLU, ALL]

Policy 2.4: The County will ensure that the provision of all necessary public facilities occurs concurrently with development to the extent possible within the constraints of facility financing programs.

Implementation Measure 2.4.1: Develop mechanisms to control the timing and phasing of development to correspond as closely as possible with the timing of provision of necessary public facilities, and coordinate proposed phasing strategies with all affected service providers. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.4.2: Condition the approval of applications for Large Scale Projects on the submittal of an acceptable strategy to ensure that the provision of all necessary public facilities is phased with the development, and that these facilities will be available concurrent with need. Potential facility phasing strategies include:

- a) Conditional approval of subdivisions subject to the availability of specified public facilities;
 - b) Control of the issuance of building permits based on thresholds established for the timing and sequencing of specified public facilities; and
 - c) Geographic allocation of building permits to areas with adequate public facilities.
- [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 3:

The establishment of equitable funding programs for the provision of all public facilities.

Policy 3.1: The County will require new development to pay its full and fair share of the facilities costs for those facilities needs created by the development, including both local and County regional facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Establish development impact fee programs to the extent that a nexus can be demonstrated between the facility type serving the unincorporated areas and the new development. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Investigate the use of turn-key programs, reimbursement agreements and other means of requiring builders to ensure that facilities are constructed and available concurrent with need. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Participate in a regional development impact fee program, in cooperation with cities, for the funding of that portion of the regional facilities needs created by new development. [DPLU, CAO, DHS, DSS]

Policy 3.2: The County will utilize all available sources to finance improvement costs for facilities serving existing residents.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Produce a community specific capital improvement program for each community and subregional plan area that:

- a) prioritizes facilities needs, b) includes a schedule for improvements, and

c) identifies the community's preferred sources of funds for needed improvements. [DPLU, ALL]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Investigate traditional and innovative financing techniques and utilize the most feasible and equitable for funding of facilities. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 3.2.3: Encourage communities desiring higher facility levels than those provided to the entire County to establish County Service Areas, Community Services Districts, Assessment Districts or other means to locally finance the improvements. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.2.4: Encourage special districts to establish benefit assessments and/or to seek all available funds to finance facilities improvements for existing residents. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Regional and subregional coordination and cooperation on public facility planning.

Policy 4.1: The County will coordinate facility planning with cities and special districts in the region.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Participate in the establishment of mechanisms for coordination, cooperation and conflict resolution between the County and the region's cities on planning, siting, funding and constructing facilities serving the entire region. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 4.1.2: Establish a mechanism for coordination, cooperation and conflict resolution at the subregional level for those facilities that cross or have impacts beyond jurisdictional boundaries. [DPLU]

Policy 4.2: The County will encourage collaboration among facility providers within the region.

Implementation Measure 4.2.1: Encourage cooperation and coordination among providers of the same facility types to encourage efficient provision of public facilities. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 4.2.2: Encourage cooperation and coordination among providers of complementary facility types (e.g., schools, parks, and libraries). [ALL]

Implementation Measure 4.2.3: Review capital improvement plans of other agencies to seek opportunities for joint siting of compatible programs, and send County capital improvement plans to other interested agencies. [OSP, DGS, ALL]

Implementation Measure 4.2.4: Contact other agencies when seeking sites for public facilities to determine if space is available in facilities housing compatible programs. [CAO, DGS]

OBJECTIVE 5:

Equitable and sufficient funds for providing public facilities.

Policy 5.1: The County will actively seek outside assistance in funding the provision of public facilities.

Implementation Measure 5.1.1: Seek outside assistance in meeting costs of new facilities and of major renovations, as appropriate:

- a) as part of redevelopment plans;
 - b) as a part of the land development process where there is the opportunity to require land dedication or reservation for County use when County facilities will serve the proposed development;
 - c) in conjunction with capital improvement plans where a County service is suitable for co-location with another service;
 - d) in negotiations on public benefit (development) agreements;
 - e) through the use of a regional impact fee;
 - f) when communities seek enhancements of County facilities to meet local standards;
 - g) other opportunities where there is an appropriate means for sharing the costs; or
 - h) through public/private partnerships.
- [CAO, DPLU, DGS]

Implementation Measure 5.1.2: Support legislation that provides new funding sources or expands existing sources for public facilities. [OIA]

Implementation Measure 5.1.3: Support legislation that assures adequate funding sources for local agencies, taking into account levels of service and facility responsibilities. [OIA]

Implementation Measure 5.1.4: Pursue all means available to secure the County's equitable portion of state revenues. [CAO, OIA]

Implementation Measure 5.1.5: Pursue, through joint efforts of the County and other jurisdictions, a coordinated legislative advocacy program for facility funding. [OIA, ALL]

SECTION 3. PARKS AND RECREATION

OVERVIEW

Parks and recreation facilities provide visual relief from concrete and pavement, make surroundings more habitable, and preserve and protect natural and historical resources.

These facilities also provide varying recreational opportunities for people of all ages, income levels, ethnic groups and physical abilities. As San Diego County continues to grow rapidly, the significance of park and recreation facility planning, acquisition and development increases. It has become evident that facilities must be provided based not only on recreational needs, but also on social needs. Since recreation plays a central role in the nurturing of children and young adults, meeting the recreational needs of youth is especially important. Equally important are the recreational needs of an expanding retirement population.

A 1987 State Department of Parks and Recreation public opinion poll found that 75% of Californians believe that spending should be increased for the protection and management of natural and cultural resources.¹ This study also found that about 67% of Californians consider the availability of public park and recreation areas important or very important to their lifestyles.

The challenge of planning for adequate parks and recreation facilities is not only in setting aside adequate quantities of land, but also in setting aside quality land that can meet the recreational needs of the entire population. For a diverse area such as San Diego County, this involves the development of many different types of parks and recreation facilities.

This section is intended to supplement other Elements in the General Plan addressing the provision of parks and recreation facilities, including the Recreation Element, the Open Space Element, and the Conservation Element. The Recreation Element provides detailed standards, criteria, and policies for the provision of recreation facilities and programs in the unincorporated area.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The County Department of Parks and Recreation has the responsibility for planning, developing, operating and maintaining County parks and recreation facilities to meet the recreational needs of all segments of the unincorporated area's population. To accomplish these tasks, the Department administers many types of park facilities ranging from ballfields to preserves for the protection of environmentally sensitive lands.

¹ State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, The Resources Agency, C.I.C. Research, Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California - 1987, San Diego, 1987.

The County also participates in joint powers agreements and other agreements that establish partnerships with other public and private agencies to develop, operate and maintain recreation facilities on land typically owned by those agencies. Public agencies participating in these agreements include school districts, water districts and community service districts. Private agencies participating in these agreements are usually non-profit organizations. In addition, many parks are provided in the unincorporated area by special districts, school districts and private non-profit organizations without any County involvement.

County parks are divided into two major categories: local parks and regional parks. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of neighborhoods and communities, while regional parks serve the population of the entire San Diego region.

LOCAL PARKS

The Recreation Element classifies local parks based on size and the population served. This classification includes neighborhood parks and community parks. Figure 3-A shows the locations of local parks in the unincorporated area, including parks developed and maintained through joint powers agreements and other agreements.

Neighborhood parks are generally small parks serving neighborhood areas with facilities such as open play fields, play equipment, and picnicking areas. This type of park is often developed in conjunction with school facilities. Community parks serve a larger area and complement neighborhood parks with more intense park facilities such as community centers, ballfield complexes and large playgrounds. Other community parks preserve and provide public access to natural or cultural resources of interest primarily to their local service communities.

REGIONAL PARKS

Regional parks are intended to serve residents and visitors of the entire County. Figure 3-B shows the location of County regional parks. Regional parks designed for intensive recreation may contain ballfields, children's play areas, or other facilities intended for active recreation. Regional parks may also include specialized facilities such as equestrian centers, swimming pools, golf courses, and areas of historic, cultural, or recreational interest to a broad spectrum of the County's population.

The larger regional parks are usually areas of natural quality for nature oriented outdoor recreation. These primarily undeveloped regional parks may include camping, riding and hiking trails, nature centers, picnic areas, active and informal play areas and natural open areas. Generally, about 80% or more of the land in these parks is reserved for preservation, natural resource management and natural open space, and 20% or less is

developed for active recreational uses. These parks must be large enough to encompass the resource to be preserved and managed, as well as to accommodate appropriate recreational use.

FIGURE 3-A GOES HERE

FIGURE 3-B GOES HERE

Other regional parks located in areas of environmental significance and beauty are classified as regional preserves, environmental reserves or open space parks. The primary purpose of these parks is to preserve sensitive environmental resources, and whenever possible, make these resources available for public enjoyment. These regional parks accommodate only minimal improvements such as trails, parking and restroom facilities. The size of these parks is dependent on the size of the resource preserved, and access is normally limited according to the sensitivity of the resource. There are also a number of regional parks with historical or cultural significance that contain important historical or cultural sites and often museums.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

LOCAL PARKS

The standard for local parks in the Recreation Element of the County General Plan is 15 acres per 1,000 population. In 1990, there were 579.3 acres of local parkland in the unincorporated area of the County, including County parks and parks provided through joint powers agreements between the County and other public and private agencies. Parks provided through joint powers agreements may be owned by an agency other than the County. The local parkland acreage total equates to 1.5 acres per 1,000 unincorporated area residents. This total does not include local parks provided in the unincorporated area without any County involvement. Although these parks may meet some of the recreation needs of particular communities, there is no inventory of these parks, therefore, they were not included in this assessment. The local parks that are provided with County involvement to serve the unincorporated area are listed in Table 3-1. Eight community centers are located in these local parks. The demand for use of these community centers is very high, indicating a need for more community centers serving the unincorporated area.

REGIONAL PARKS

In 1990, there were 16,330 acres of regional parkland provided by the County. This total includes primarily developed regional parks and regional parks that contain some recreation development, but are primarily undeveloped. Table 3-2 shows the regional parks that are included in the regional park acreage total. This total includes Mission Trails Park, Los Peñasquitos Preserve and Harry Griffen Park. These parks are administered by Joint Powers Agreements that include the County. Mission Trails Park and Los Peñasquitos Preserve are located in the City of San Diego, and are jointly administered by the City and the County. In 1990, recreation development in both of these parks was in the planning stages. Harry Griffen Park is located within the City of La Mesa, and is administered through a Joint Powers Agreement that includes the City of La Mesa, the City of El Cajon, the Helix Water District, the Grossmont Union High School District and the County. The County regional parkland total equates to

approximately 6.6 acres per 1,000 residents of the entire region. The State, the City of San Diego and other cities in the region also provide substantial amounts of regional parkland.

TABLE 3-1
LOCAL PARKS IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA IN 1990

LOCAL PARKS	ACREAGE	COMMUNITY CENTERS	JOINT POWERS AGREEMENTS ¹
COMMUNITY PARKS			
Alpine Youth Center and Community Park	7.2	X	X
Borrego Youth Center	35.1	X	X
Cactus Park	60.0		
Collier Park	8.3		
Descanso Community Park	3.8		X
Eucalyptus Park	7.8		
Fallbrook Community Center	7.2	X	
Goodland Acres Park	1.3	X	X
Jamul-Dulzura Union School District Park	18.8		X
Lincoln Acres Park	0.5	X	
Lindo Lake Park	56.5		
Nancy Jane Park	1.9		
Robert Adams Community Park	38.4		X
Spring Valley Park	5.8	X	X
Valley Center Community Park	14.1		X
Warner Union School District Park	3.0	X	X
Well Field Park	145.9	X	X
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS			
Avocado Elementary School Park	5.1		X
Alturas Street Park	0.8		
Bancroft Park ²	1.2		
Cottonwood Park I	5.4		
Cottonwood Park II	8.2		
Cottonwood Park III	10.0		
Damon Lane Park	29.0		
Del Parque	10.0		
Estrella Drive Park	6.7		
Hanson Lane School Park	5.0		X
Jacumba Park	19.8		
Julian High School Park	3.0		X
Lamar Street Park	8.9		
Old Ironsides Park	3.6		
Rainbow Park	4.4		
Ramona Community School Park	4.5		
Ramona Elementary School Park	4.0		X
Riverview Elementary School Park	4.0		X

South Lane Park	10.5		X
Steele Canyon Park	5.3		
Sweetwater Lane Park	11.3		
W.D. Hall Elementary School Park	3.0		X
LOCAL PARK ACREAGE TOTAL	579.3		

¹ *Parks provided through joint powers agreements are established through partnerships between the County and other public and private agencies. These parks may be owned by an agency other than the County.*

² *This park contains an historic site, which is listed in Table 3-3.*

**TABLE 3-2
COUNTY REGIONAL PARKS IN 1990**

REGIONAL PARKS	ACREAGE
PRIMARILY DEVELOPED	
Dos Picos Park	79
El Monte Park	89
Felicita Park	52
Flinn Springs Park	40
Harry Griffen Park ¹	52
Lake Jennings Park	100
Live Oak Park	26
Mount Helix Park	13
Otay Lake Park	70
Palomar Mountain	4
Pine Valley Park	17
Potrero Park	112
Quail Botanical Gardens	28
San Dieguito Park	124
 PRIMARILY UNDEVELOPED²	
Agua Caliente Springs Park	790
Guajome Park ²	542
Lake Morena Park	3,273
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve ^{3,4}	2,787
Louis A. Stelzer Park	310
Mission Trails Park ⁴	5,995
Sunset Park	20
Sweetwater Park	571
Vallecito Park ³	61
Volcan Mountain Park	228
William Heise Park	947
 REGIONAL PARK ACREAGE TOTAL	16,330 Acres

¹ *This park is operated and maintained through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) that includes the County, the City of El Cajon, the City of La Mesa and other local jurisdictions.*

- ² *Generally, less than 20% of the acreage of these parks is developed for recreation uses, such as camping and picnicking.*
- ³ *These regional parks contain historic sites, which are listed in Table 3-3.*
- ⁴ *These parks are jointly owned and administered by the County and City of San Diego. Development of recreation facilities in these parks is currently in the planning stages.*

Although the County provides a considerable amount of regional parkland, the majority of this acreage is undeveloped. Primarily undeveloped regional parks make up over 95% of the regional park acreage total. Generally, 80% or more of the land in these parks is reserved for preservation, natural resource management and natural open space, and only 20% or less is used for recreation development. The use of active recreation areas within regional parks is very high, indicating a need for additional regional parkland developed for active recreation.

The total regional parkland acreage listed in this Element does not include regional preserves, environmental reserve areas and open space parks with only minimal improvements such as trails, parking and restroom facilities. Historic sites are also not included in the regional parkland total. The primary purpose of these parks is the protection and management of natural and historical resources; recreational use is a secondary objective. These facilities are not included in the regional park acreage total because a quantitative evaluation would not accurately reflect the significance of these natural and historic resources. Table 3-3 lists these regional parks and historic sites. In addition to the parks listed in Table 3-2 and 3-3, in 1990 two significant regional parks were in the planning stages: the proposed San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park and the proposed Otay Valley Regional Park.

FUNDING METHODS

Existing sources of funding and land for local park development are the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance, state and federal grant funds, and the County General Fund. For regional park development, existing funding sources include state and federal grant funds and the County General Fund.

PARK LANDS DEDICATION ORDINANCE

The Quimby Act (Government Code Section 66477) specifies that new subdivisions can be required to dedicate land or pay a fee in-lieu of dedication for local parks at a level of 3 acres per 1,000 population. Up to five acres per 1,000 population can be required if the current local park acreage exceeds the 3 acre level. These fees cannot be used for regional parks.

The County implemented the Quimby Act by adopting the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). This ordinance requires developers to dedicate land, or pay or guarantee an in-lieu fee for the provision of local park facilities before final subdivision map approval. This requirement is based on the provision of 3 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents, since existing local park acreages do not exceed this level. For the purposes of local park planning and distribution of PLDO funding, the unincorporated area is divided into Local Park Planning Areas (LPPAs). PLDO money collected within a particular LPPA must be spent on local parks that will directly serve residents within

that planning area.

**TABLE 3-3
COUNTY REGIONAL PRESERVES,
REGIONAL RESERVES, OPEN SPACE PARKS
AND HISTORIC SITES IN 1990**

REGIONAL PRESERVES, REGIONAL RESERVES AND REGIONAL OPEN SPACE PARKS	ACREAGE ¹
El Capitan Regional Open Space Preserve	2,800
Hellhole Canyon Regional Open Space Preserve	4,921
In-ko-pah Park	160
Mason Wildlife	90
Minshall/Oak Oasis	398
Mountain Springs	129
Otay Park	40
San Elijo Lagoon Ecological Reserve	808
South Bay Biological Study Area	27
Mt. Gower Regional Open Space Preserve	1,574
Sycamore Canyon Regional Open Space Preserve	1,692
Wilderness Gardens Preserve	611
ACREAGE TOTAL	13,250 Acres

HISTORIC SITES
<p style="text-align: center;">Bancroft Park Campo Stone Store Heritage Park Los Coches Monument Julian Park and Museum Oak Grove Monument Rancho Peñasquitos Adobe Rancho Guajome Adobe Whaley House/Pendleton House Vallecito Stage Station</p>

¹ *These acreages do not apply toward the regional park acreage total.*

STATE AND FEDERAL GRANTS

State and federal grant funds are available for both local and regional park development, and are the single most important funding source for both acquisition and development of parkland.

COUNTY GENERAL FUND

General fund allocations for park expansion, acquisition, or development have been restricted to grant matching funds. No general fund monies have been budgeted for park expansion, acquisition or development in the last decade.

ISSUES

1. Local parkland deficiencies exist for unincorporated area residents.

Discussion: The amount of local parkland, 1.5 acres per 1,000 unincorporated area residents, is well below acceptable levels. The Recreation Element establishes a standard of 15 acres of local parkland per 1,000 unincorporated area residents. In order to make up existing local parkland deficiencies, external funding sources must be identified.

2. Quimby Act limitations make it difficult to achieve the goal facility level for local parks.

Discussion: The Quimby Act (Government Code Section 66477 et seq.) authorizes local jurisdictions to require developers to dedicate land or pay in-lieu fees for local parks. Currently, the amount that new development can be required to provide is limited to three acres per 1,000 residents. The Quimby Act prevents the County from requiring subdivision development to provide local park acreages at the goal level of 15 acres per 1000 residents. Thus, as new growth occurs, the gap between the goal level and the existing level will increase.

3. Some local parkland remains undeveloped due to the lack of an operation and maintenance funding entity.

Discussion: Due to general fund constraints, the County cannot support the operation and maintenance of new local parks. Since ongoing operation and maintenance costs can be significant, an operation and maintenance funding entity other than the general fund must exist before a local park can be developed. Few of these entities have been formed, therefore, a significant amount of land

designated for local parks is not being developed in a timely manner. Most of this land is dedicated or purchased with fee revenue paid by new development in accordance with the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance.

4. Opportunities to acquire undeveloped land for park purposes is decreasing.

Discussion: Rapid growth in the County is projected to continue for the foreseeable future. Since this growth results in construction on previously undeveloped land, the opportunity to acquire land for recreation, open space, or preservation and protection of environmental resources may not be present in the near future. Every effort must be made to acquire land before this window of opportunity closes.

5. State and federal grant requirements make it difficult for the County to compete for these funds.

Discussion: Proposition 70, approved by the voters in 1988, has made state grant funds available to local jurisdictions for park acquisition and development. In addition, pending 1990 state and federal legislation would establish additional large scale grant funding programs. Most grant funds are distributed competitively with local grant matching requirements. These matching requirements put San Diego County at a disadvantage because the County cannot always identify funds to meet the grant matching requirements.

6. Cooperation is necessary to mitigate the impacts of new development on regional parks.

Discussion: Regional parks serve the entire region's population. Population growth in cities, as well as in the unincorporated area, creates the need for more regional park acreage. The County provides a large amount of the regional parkland used by all residents. The State, the City of San Diego, and other cities in the region also provide substantial amounts of such parkland. Regional cooperation is necessary to develop plans to meet regional recreational needs and to establish a program to mitigate the regional park impacts of new development throughout the region.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES THAT MEET THE RECREATIONAL, CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION, CULTURAL AND AESTHETIC NEEDS OF COUNTY RESIDENTS AND VISITORS OF ALL AGES, INCOME LEVELS, ETHNIC GROUPS AND PHYSICAL ABILITIES.

GOAL

FIFTEEN ACRES OF LOCAL PARKLAND PER 1,000 UNINCORPORATED AREA RESIDENTS.

GOAL

FIFTEEN ACRES OF REGIONAL PARKLAND PER 1,000 RESIDENTS IN THE REGION, EXCLUSIVE OF REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVES, REGIONAL OPEN SPACES AND PRESERVE PARKS.

OBJECTIVE 1: Provide, in the short term, five acres of local parks per 1,000 unincorporated area residents, and the County's equitable portion of the regional park facilities level of fifteen acres per 1,000 residents in the region.

Policy 1.1: The County will seek additional funding sources for the acquisition, expansion and development of local and regional parks.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Utilize the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance to meet the local park needs of new development to the extent allowable under state law. [DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Investigate the feasibility of a development impact fee for regional parks to ensure that new development contributes its fair and full share of the costs of regional parks. [DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Actively seek state and federal grants for the acquisition, expansion and development of local and regional parks. [DPR]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Promote appropriate state and federal legislation that would provide funding for local and regional parks, and equitable state and federal grant allocation formulas that do not require matching funds. [OIA, DPR]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Support statewide bond issues providing funds for local and regional parks. [OIA, DPR]

Implementation Measure 1.1.6: Encourage communities to seek contributions from private organizations and community groups for the acquisition, development, operation and maintenance of local and regional parks. [DPR]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Parks and recreation facilities responsive to the recreational, aesthetic, conservation and preservation needs of the population served.

Policy 2.1: Decisions on the potential acquisition of land for the development of local or regional parks or land banked for future park development will be made according to specified criteria.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Develop criteria upon which land acquisition decisions will be based. Included in these criteria will be classifications of appropriate types of lands that can be used for various types of parks, consideration of the presence of any wildlife habitats, endangered species or wetlands, and a scientifically verified and legally defensible method to evaluate land values. [DPR]

Policy 2.2: The County will site, plan and develop local and regional parks that are compatible with community character, land use and the recreational, conservation, and preservation needs of the intended service population.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Develop a Master Local Park Plan for each Local Park Planning Area (LPPA) in the unincorporated area. Establish, within these plans, a prioritized capital improvement program based on a survey of existing local park facilities and an assessment of the facility needs of each LPPA. Identify and include, as appropriate, local parks provided without County involvement in the survey of local park facilities. Include social factors in the assessment of need, especially meeting the recreational needs of youth and the elderly. [DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Include an assessment of existing local park

facilities and local park needs in Community and Subregional Plans during the update process. [DPLU, DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.3: Refer discretionary projects that propose dedication of land for local parks to the Department of Parks and Recreation to ensure that local park requirements established in the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance and siting criteria are met. [DPLU, DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.4: When feasible, preserve significant environmental or historical areas as regional parks to make outstanding features accessible for public enjoyment. The size and extent of development of these parks will be determined by the sensitivity of the area, and the need to preserve and protect the unique environmental or historical features. [DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.5: Actively pursue regional intensive recreational uses in environmentally suitable areas that are accessible and responsive to the needs of the region. [DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.6: When necessary to protect the values of regional parks, impose land use controls such as design review, Site Plan review or subdivision conditions, to ensure that development of properties adjacent to these regional parks is compatible with the park use. [DPLU, DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.7: Ensure the input of private non-profit organizations, and other community groups in siting, planning, and developing local and regional parks. [DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.8: Design local and regional parks and recreation facilities to minimize operation and maintenance costs, and incorporate appropriate water conservation measures. [DPR]

Implementation Measure 2.2.9: Do not develop local or regional parks until an entity is identified to provide funding for ongoing operation and maintenance costs. [DPR]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Regional cooperation and coordination on park siting, planning and development.

Policy 3.1: The County will coordinate with all jurisdictions within the region to cooperatively develop plans for the provision of regional parks.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Establish a mechanism including the County and all cities in the region to cooperatively develop a plan for regional parks throughout the County. This plan should establish priorities for land acquisition and park development, and cooperative siting and funding policies. [DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Coordinate with cities on the planning and development of regional parks that include both city and unincorporated area property. [DPR, DPLU]

Policy 3.2: The County will promote the joint planning, development, operation and maintenance of local and regional parks and complementary facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Work with school districts, water districts, the County Library District, cities and other agencies to plan and site local and regional parks and their respective facilities when co-location is appropriate. [DPR, LIB, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Participate in joint powers agreements and other similar agreements with the school districts, water districts, the County Library, cities and other appropriate agencies for the acquisition, development, operation and maintenance of local and regional parks. [DPR, LIB]

SECTION 4. TRANSPORTATION

OVERVIEW

An efficient integrated transportation system promotes the movement of people and goods in a timely and orderly fashion. Transportation facilities located within the County include freeways and highways, streets and roads, public transit, bikeways and aviation facilities.

While San Diego County's transportation system offers commuters a range of choices, the automobile is by far the most popular and most frequently chosen method of transportation in the County. During the 10 year period from 1978 to 1988, when population increased by 22%, licensed drivers in the region increased by 40% (to 1,612,000 drivers), auto registrations increased by 64% (to 1,348,000 registrations) and weekday vehicle miles of travel increased by 63%. During this same period, increases in freeway facilities (11%) and local street and road mileage (16%) did not keep up with the increasing demand.¹

Transit service also plays an important role in the transportation system within the County. Public transit provides a relatively inexpensive and efficient method of transportation, and is the predominant form of transportation for many people, especially students, low income persons and the elderly. The remaining modes of transportation such as air, rail, bicycle and walking represent a small but important amount of total trips within the County.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is designated by both the state and federal governments as the agency responsible for regional transportation planning. In this role, SANDAG prepares a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the San Diego region. The RTP is updated approximately every two years and includes goals and objectives for all forms of transportation facilities in the County. The road network in the County Circulation Element is coordinated with the freeway and highway system presented in the RTP. By working cooperatively and using common information and projections, the County and SANDAG coordinate their plans to provide a regional transportation system that is efficient, safe and convenient.

This section is intended to supplement the Circulation Element of the General Plan. The Circulation Element is a schematic representation of the transportation corridors and widths required at ultimate development of the County General Plan. It also delineates a bikeway system intended to link bicycle traffic within and between communities.

¹ San Diego Association of Governments, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan, p. 55-56.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The County of San Diego is responsible for ensuring the planning, development and maintenance of transportation facilities located in the unincorporated area. In addition, the County works closely with other agencies, including SANDAG, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), the North San Diego County Transit Development Board, and the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) to aid in the planning of transportation facilities and services throughout the region.

ROAD AND BRIDGE FACILITIES

Travel by bicycle, car or public transit utilizes roads and bridges. With the increasing population and automobile usage in San Diego County, the amount of traffic on the roads has increased. Expanding the County road and bridge network is a continual process. In 1990, there were approximately 1,864 miles of County-maintained roadways in the unincorporated area, including both Circulation Element and non-Circulation Element roads. Additional roads in the unincorporated area that are not constructed or maintained by the County include freeways, highways and private roads.

The County Circulation Element is divided into two parts: maps and a written text. The nine Circulation Element maps covering the entire County depict the major roads and bicycle routes in the County, both existing and proposed. This is the County's plan for the location and size of roads that will be required in the future to serve proposed land uses in the unincorporated area. The size of each road varies from 2 to 6 lanes based on the forecasted number of trips to be made on the road.

The vehicular capacity of a roadway is measured by a Level of Service scale. With six tiers (A thru F), the level of service for a particular road is a measure of speed and travel time, traffic interruptions or restrictions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driver comfort and convenience, and economy. Level of Service "A" is identified as free vehicular flow with few conflicts or interruptions, while "F" is identified as highly congested stop-and-go with many vehicular conflicts and interruptions. Level of Service "C" is considered to be the desired service level on County roads.

The Circulation Element maps are important tools for preserving road rights-of-way and planning for needed road construction. As development occurs and creates the demand for additional roadways, the roads are constructed. The County Board of Supervisors approves updates to the Circulation Element maps as land use changes are approved. County transportation planning is coordinated with the cities in the region to ensure that region-serving roads common to multiple agencies are planned to meet the expected demand in all areas, and that widths and alignments are compatible.

Roads in the unincorporated area are constructed by both the County and by private property owners. The County builds needed roads to the extent that funds are available; however, the majority of the roads in the unincorporated area are constructed by private property owners as a condition of development. This includes roads within development projects, peripheral roads and off-site roads, if warranted by the demand generated by the development.

To support County road construction and maintenance, the County Department of Public Works operates 17 road maintenance stations. These stations serve as staging areas for road maintenance crews. Twelve borrow pits, 8 County owned and 4 leased, provide the paving and gravel materials needed to maintain the roadways. Figure 4-A shows the locations of the County road maintenance stations and borrow pits.

In addition to roads, the County also builds and maintains bridges in the unincorporated area. In October 1989 there were a total of 650 bridge or dip structures in the unincorporated area of the County, including 120 bridges with a span of 20 feet or more, 67 bridges with a span of less than 20 feet, 385 culverts, and 78 dip structures. These structures are located on both Circulation Element and non-Circulation Element roads.

Responsibility for the construction of bridge structures is borne by both developers and the County. The majority of the bridge structures are provided by the County; however, in some cases developers are required to build a bridge structure as a condition of development. The County contracts for the construction of bridges to private firms and assumes maintenance responsibility for them upon completion.

BICYCLE FACILITIES

The mild year-round climate in the San Diego region makes the area ideal for the use of bicycles for transportation. Currently, there are over 230,000 bicycle trips made daily within the San Diego region on more than 450 miles of designated bikeways and other roadways. Increased costs for motorized travel, congested roads and highways and a greater emphasis on physical fitness have all contributed to greater bicycle ridership. Because of the growing demand for transportation by bicycle, increased attention is being focused on this mode of travel.

Bicycle use, however, has not increased at the rate projected in the 1985 SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG projected a 10% increase between 1985 and 1987, while actual ridership during this period increased by only 5%. Major reasons for the slower increase in ridership include inadequate funding for bikeway projects, which has resulted in a 50% completion rate of planned bikeway projects, and a lack of incentives to encourage bicycle ridership.

FIGURE 4-A GOES HERE

In the unincorporated area of San Diego County, there were a total of 70 miles of Bikeways in 1990. Of the 70 miles of Bikeways in the unincorporated area, Bike Lanes account for 68.5 miles, Bike Paths for 1.0 mile and Bike Routes for .5 miles. Definitions of Bikeways, Bike Lanes, Bike Paths and Bike Routes are contained in the Circulation Element. The Bicycle Network Map of the Circulation Element, in addition to showing existing Bikeways, maps over 300 miles of planned Bikeways that are not yet constructed.

Bicycle facilities in the unincorporated area are constructed by both developers and the County. Beginning in 1989, the County embarked on an aggressive program to expand the existing Bicycle Network. When improving property along roadways with planned Bikeways, the County requires the provision of Bikeways as part of the road improvements. State and Federal funding is being actively pursued to complete the remaining Bikeway segments.

In an effort to encourage bicycle ridership by both its employees and the general public, the County of San Diego has placed bicycle lockers at 14 County buildings and at regional transit centers. Currently, there are 59 lockers (holding 118 bicycles) at County buildings and a total of 20 additional lockers (holding 40 bicycles) in place at the Chula Vista and Oceanside Transit Centers. Bicycle racks and posts are also available.

TRANSIT FACILITIES

The San Diego County Transit System provides public transportation services to the unincorporated area and to 14 of the region's 18 cities. Public transit planning is done on a regional basis by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, the North County Transit District and SANDAG, with input from the County. The County Department of Public Works completes short-range transit plans and transportation improvement programs for the systems it operates.

The County Transit System utilizes six types of transit services in its effort to provide a functional and responsive transit system. These are Suburban Fixed Route, Commuter Express Bus, Rural Lifeline service, Airporter service, Elderly and Disabled Dial-A-Ride service and General Public Dial-A-Ride services. Through these programs, the County Transit System serves almost two million passengers annually. Table 4-1 describes the different types of transit service and lists ridership levels for FY 89-90. All transit services offered by the County Transit System are provided by private contractors. In 1990, there were 10 contracted transit service providers. Seven contractors use their own vehicles, while the remaining three operate County-owned vehicles. In all cases, County Transit Service contractors provide vehicle maintenance and storage facilities.

As a means of integrating different transportation systems and types, increasing ridership and increasing accessibility, the County provides transit centers. Transit centers generally serve a number of routes and have over 500 boardings per day. The Transportation Development Act allows the County to build transit centers anywhere in the County. Once the center is built, the

TABLE 4-1
SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT SERVICE FY 1989-1990

SERVICE TYPE	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE	NO. OF FIXED ROUTES	ESTIMATED ANNUAL PASSENGERS
SUBURBAN FIXED ROUTE SERVICE	Fixed bus routes serving the cities and communities of La Mesa, Lemon Grove, El Cajon, Santee, Spring Valley, Rancho San Diego, Lakeside and Alpine. All of the routes offer connections to the San Diego Trolley and to San Diego Transit routes.	8	1,397,000
COMMUTER EXPRESS BUS	Fixed bus routes providing round trip service from Poway to downtown San Diego, Escondido to downtown San Diego and Oceanside to downtown San Diego. Connections to other transit services are also available along these routes.	3	170,000
POWAY TRANSIT SERVICES	There are three different services provided in the Poway area. The first service consists of fixed bus routes serving Poway with connections to San Diego Transit routes. Second is the Poway Dial-A-Ride, which provides demand responsive service to the general public. Third is the Poway Airporter, which is a demand-responsive service operating between Poway and the San Diego International Airport-Lindbergh Field.	3, N/A, N/A	254,700
RURAL BUS SERVICE	Fixed bus routes providing service from the rural eastern areas of the County to the cities of El Cajon and La Mesa with connections to San Diego Transit, the San Diego Trolley and other County Transit System routes.	7	16,800
ELDERLY and DISABLED DIAL-A-RIDE	Demand-responsive dial-a-ride providing service to elderly and disabled clientele in the cities and communities of El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, Lakeside and Alpine.	N/A	46,000
SPRING VALLEY DIAL-A-RIDE	Demand-responsive dial-a-ride for the general public serving the community of Spring Valley.	N/A	41,000

transit operator serving the center generally is responsible for facility maintenance and upkeep. In 1990, the County-owned, either solely or in partnership with other jurisdictions, the following four transit centers:

- o Oceanside -- County owned
- o Escondido -- Joint ownership between the County and North County Transit
- o San Diego State University -- County-owned
- o Chula Vista Bayfront Trolley Station -- Joint ownership between the County and the City of Chula Vista.

Figure 4-B shows the locations of both existing and proposed County-owned transit centers. Other existing transit centers constructed by the County but owned by other jurisdictions are:

- o University Towne Center
- o Vista

AVIATION FACILITIES

Aviation facilities in San Diego County include 40 airports and 39 heliports. Of these facilities, 8 of the airports and 3 of the heliports (located at county airports) are owned by the County. One of the airports, Fallbrook, is leased and operated by a private group. Lindbergh Field, San Diego's major airport serving approximately 11 million passengers per year, is owned and operated by the San Diego Unified Port District and is not discussed in this Element. Figure 4-C shows the locations of all County-owned aviation facilities.

Public airports typically prepare an Airport Master Plan for the ultimate development of the airport's facilities. Additionally, State law requires each public airport to adopt a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.). These plans are prepared for the area surrounding each facility to ensure compatibility between adjacent land uses and the operation and/or expansion of the airport. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan also addresses noise levels, maximum building heights in surrounding areas and other public safety issues.

The 8 airports and 3 heliports that are owned by the County cover a combined total of 2,254 acres. Currently, there are approximately 1,562 private aircraft based at these facilities that, when combined with visiting aircraft, conduct approximately 534,921 operations per year (an operation is defined as one takeoff or one landing). Table 4-2 identifies the County-owned aviation facilities and lists the size and usage levels for each facility.

FIGURE 4-C GOES HERE

MAP TO GO HERE

**TABLE 4-2
COUNTY OWNED AVIATION
FACILITIES IN 1989**

AIRCRAFT ¹	No. OF BASED ACRES	TOTAL OPERATIONS	ANNUAL No. OF	NAME
Agua Caliente Springs Airport		1	20	300 ²
Borrego Valley Airport		31	198	41,620 ³
Fallbrook Community Airport		77	290	1,995 ³
Gillespie Field Airport and Heliport		635	743	174,599 ⁴
Jacumba Airport		7	131	2,500 ²
McClellan Palomar Airport and Heliport	422	486	206,692 ⁴	
Ocotillo Airport		0	344	200 ²
Ramona Airport and Heliport		220	342	113,184 ²
TOTAL(S)		1,393	2,554	541,090

¹ Based Aircraft: All figures are for 1989 except Fallbrook (1987).

² 1989 estimated number.

³ 1987 number.

⁴ 1988 number.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

STREETS AND ROADS FACILITY LEVEL

The existing street and road system in the unincorporated County is generally operating at an acceptable level of service; a majority of the streets and roads experience little or no congestion. Most of the congestion that does exist in the unincorporated area takes place on major arterials during peak-hour traffic periods. Commuters approaching freeways to go to work cause congestion on the main arterials and also add to the congestion on the region's freeways in the more urbanized areas. As urban land uses have been extended outward to the more rural areas, and commuters drive greater distances to their

workplaces, the amount of congestion on the region's freeways and highways has increased.

BICYCLE FACILITY LEVEL

While the Bicycle Network Map of the Circulation Element shows almost 400 miles of proposed bikeways in the unincorporated area, by 1990 only 70 miles of bikeways had been constructed. This level is not considered adequate to meet the needs of the unincorporated area.

TRANSIT FACILITY LEVEL

As the population of the San Diego region has grown, the use of transit services has increased. In addition to the completed transit centers, the following centers are planned for development by the County:

- o County Administration Center
- o Carlsbad Transit Center
- o Grossmont College Transit Center
- o Spring Valley Transit Center
- o Southwestern College Transit Center
- o Santee Transit Center
- o Oceanside Transit Center Phase II
- o Bayfront Trolley Station Phase II

In addition, a transit center is planned for Rancho San Diego. This center is being built by a private developer. Analysis of potential additional transit center sites will occur prior to completion of those currently planned.

AVIATION FACILITY LEVEL

Currently, the County's general aviation demands are being met by existing facilities. In 1989, there were 1,352 aircraft based at the County airports, and a combined total of 561,511 take-offs and landings conducted at the airports.

FUNDING METHODS

Funding transportation improvements in the County is becoming increasingly difficult. Previously used funding sources have in large part either been abolished or severely curtailed. Hardest hit have been funds available for routine operation and maintenance of existing facilities. As a result, funds that were previously available for construction of new facilities are now being channeled towards the operation and maintenance of existing facilities. In order to meet the needs of a growing County, new and alternate funding sources have been developed. These new sources, combined with the traditional funding mechanisms, still do not meet the entire transportation funding needs in the County. Some funding sources are exclusive to one type of transportation, while others are available for several modes.

STREETS AND ROADS FUNDING

State Subventions

The State provides transportation funding to the County through several programs. A State tax on gasoline provides funds which can be used for operation and maintenance costs or for the construction of roads, bridges and bikeways. The County also receives funds from the Streets and Highway Code, Section 2104(d) based on the ratio of registered vehicles throughout the County to the total vehicle registration throughout the State. These funds can be used for road construction.

Fines and Forfeitures

A portion of the revenues collected by the municipal courts for Vehicle Code violations (Vehicle Code Sections 42201 and 42210.5) are received by the County Road Fund for use in road maintenance and construction.

Development Exactions

Within the County, developers are generally required to construct all roads within their projects. In some cases developers may also be required to make off-site improvements to roads to mitigate the traffic impacts of the development.

Transportation Sales Tax (TransNet)

The passage of Proposition A (TransNet) in November of 1987, which raised the sales tax by one-half cent, is expected to provide the region with approximately \$2.25 billion over the 20 year lifespan of the tax. Approximately \$750 million will be generated for improvements to the each of the following: the region's highways, local streets and roads, and transit. From 1990 to 1995, the County will receive approximately \$56.7 million dollars in TransNet funds for local streets and roads, to expand and improve the existing road system in the unincorporated area. Additionally, \$1 million per year will be provided for the construction of bikeways throughout the region. The amount of TransNet funding received by the County and other jurisdictions each year is determined by SANDAG. SANDAG reviews TransNet funding requests in the region and determines the projects to be funded and the timing of funding.

Bridge and Thoroughfare Fee

A fee for bridges and thoroughfares is authorized by Government Code Section 66484 et seq. This statute authorizes the County to institute a fee to be applied to all new development in an identified area of benefit to offset the construction or expansion costs of planned Circulation Element roads, bridges and bikeways needed to serve the development.

Federal and State Grants

In FY90-91 the County received funding through three grant programs for use on transportation facilities: \$500,000 from the Community Development Block Grant, and \$2.5 million from the Federal Highway Administration. The County is also eligible to receive funds under the Combined Road Plan Program, which was created with the consolidation of the Federal Aid-Urban, Federal Aid-Secondary and Bridge Replacement Programs.

Assessment Districts

The Improvement Act of 1911 and the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 enable the County to establish assessment districts to finance the construction or acquisition of public improvements, including roads and bridges, through the sale of bonds. The County can issue bonds to finance public improvements using the Improvement Act of 1911 or the Improvement Bond Act of 1915. Bonds are retired through assessments levied on properties receiving benefit from the improvement.

Prior to 1977 assessment districts were used extensively for both large and small scale projects. However, with the passage of Proposition 13, the use of assessment districts in the County to finance transportation projects decreased dramatically. Between 1977 and 1989, there were no assessment districts formed for the purpose of funding transportation projects. However, in 1989, the formation of 4 assessment districts for transportation improvements in large-scale projects were being processed by the County.

AIRPORT FUNDING

Federal and State Funding

Federal and State grants for public airports are available for the design and construction of aviation related projects that have been recommended in an airport master plan or approved on an airport layout plan. Grant funds can also be obtained for the preparation of planning documents, such as airport master plans. Grant funds typically cover 80 to 90 percent of the total project cost. Grant funding is generated from fuel taxes, ticket surcharges and aircraft registration fees levied upon users of aviation facilities.

Lease Revenues

Another source of revenue for aviation facilities is the income earned from leased properties at County Airports. These revenues are used for capital improvements and maintenance at the eight County airports.

TRANSIT FUNDING

Federal and State Funds

Transit center funding is available from the Transportation Development Act, and through grants from Combined Road Plan², State Transit Capital Improvement Program (TCI) and State Inter-modal sources. Grant funding is sought and utilized whenever available to supplement other sources.

Development Exactions

The County may require developers to construct transit facilities if their projects cause a need for additional or expanded transit service.

Transportation Sales Tax

The County Transit System is receiving approximately \$130,000 per year from TransNet to subsidize elderly and disabled services and senior fares.

BICYCLE FUNDING

Developer Exactions and Contributions

Many of the bikeways that are constructed in the unincorporated area are built by property owners as a condition of development. When a project is located on a roadway designated as a bikeway in the Circulation Element, the developer is required to construct the bikeway that abuts his property.

Transportation Sales Tax

The collection of the transportation sales tax (TransNet) is providing the San Diego region with \$1 million per year (for 20 years) for the improvement and expansion of bicycle facilities. In FY89-90, the County received \$210,000 from TransNet to fund the development of additional bikeways and related facilities in the unincorporated area.

Federal and State Funds

State Transportation Development Act Funds provide approximately \$1 million per year to the region for bicycle facility improvements within road rights-of-way. In FY89-90 the County share of this money was \$460,000. SANDAG reviews all of the projects requesting funding from this source and determines which will be funded. Funds from the State Bike Lane Account are available on a competitive basis for bicycle facility improvements serving commuter cyclists. The maximum amount that an agency can be granted in one year from this source is \$90,000.

² Combined Road Plan funds used for transit center development are received from local jurisdictions that will benefit from the transit center.

ISSUES

1. Increases in the amount of automobile use have resulted in increased congestion on the region's roadways.

Discussion: The dramatic rise in automobile use has far surpassed the ability of the County and other jurisdictions to upgrade and maintain the highway and road system. As the number of vehicles on the roadways has increased, the expansion of existing roadways and the construction of new roadways has not kept pace. Between 1978 and 1988, automobile registrations increased by 64% while increases in local street and road mileage only rose by 16%. As a result, certain roadways are functioning at a Level of Service "E" or "F" on a routine basis.

A LOS "C", which allows for stable traffic flow with room to maneuver, is a generally accepted level to strive for in new development. At this level, traffic generally flows smoothly, although freedom to maneuver within the roadway is somewhat restricted and lane changes require additional care.

However, there are some cases where development cannot achieve a LOS "C" on off-site roadways. For instance, there are areas where the existing development pattern precludes the addition of lanes or other mitigation or when the community is opposed to certain improvements to maintain a LOS "C". Additionally, there are existing roadways in the County that are currently operating below a LOS "C". Such cases are currently exceptions and generally occur when there is insufficient right-of-way to expand or modify a roadway or when the existing development in the area has generated more traffic than anticipated. In these cases a Level of Service "D" is acceptable on off-site roadways. At this level, small increases in flow cause substantial deterioration in service. Freedom to maneuver is limited and minor incidents can cause substantial interruption in the traffic flow.

When the roadway system reaches a LOS "E" or "F", or new development would push it to LOS "E" or "F", new development should not be approved unless the project can mitigate the LOS "E" or contribute a fair share to a program to mitigate the project's impacts, unless a statement of overriding findings can be made.

In order to control the amount of traffic on the roadways, and subsequently the amount of congestion, it is necessary to apply the LOS measurement to all roads that are impacted by a proposed project. The effect of a project on the road system varies from project to project. Due to the size and type of project, the type and capacity of roads serving the project, the amount of traffic generated by the development and the existing development pattern, the impact will vary from one project to another. To apply a LOS standard to only major or larger capacity roads or to within a specified geographic distance of a project could result in an inadequate review of the impacts of a project and create the potential for increased congestion. Therefore, project impacts should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

2. New development has a regionwide impact on transportation facilities extending beyond jurisdictional boundaries.

Discussion: New development, regardless of the type, results in additional trips being taken on the region's transportation facilities. When development occurs, the automobile trips generated by the

development are not restricted to the area immediately surrounding the development. Rather, the trips are made throughout the region. These trips not only increase the level of congestion on the transportation facilities in the community where the development is located, but also on the facilities in surrounding jurisdictions, and throughout the entire region.

3. The increased reliance on personal vehicles has resulted in increased congestion on the region's roadways and highways.

Discussion: A majority of the trips taken throughout the region is made in personal vehicles occupied by one person. This reliance on personal vehicles has contributed greatly to increased congestion and longer delays on the region's roads and highways.

Efforts to reduce the congestion on the roadways have traditionally focused on the construction of new roads or the expansion of existing roads. Recently, agencies have been developing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs to better manage travel demand during the busiest travel times and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the region's transportation systems. To achieve these goals, TDM includes the development and implementation of programs designed to influence traveler behavior by modifications in travel mode, frequency, time, route, vehicle occupancy, direction, trip length or facility assignment³.

Additionally, legislation adopted in 1990 (Propositions 108 and 111) addressed the traffic congestion problem. The measures provide additional funding for transportation improvements, but also place additional requirements on the receipt of these funds. The legislation requires the preparation and adoption of a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. One of the requirements of the CMP is that Level of Service standards be adopted for all state highways and for principal arterials. The LOS can be set at "E" or the current level, whichever is lower. Failure to meet this standard could result in the withholding of transportation improvement funds.

4. The need for transportation improvements has increased faster than funds have been made available to finance the improvements.

Discussion: The large-scale rapid growth experienced throughout the region in the 1980s resulted in an increased burden on the region's transportation facilities. Funding needed to expand the facilities has not kept pace with the improvements needed to accommodate the increased use. Even with the funding provided by passage of Proposition A (TransNet), construction and maintenance of much of the region's transportation system remains underfunded. In the unincorporated area in 1989, there was a \$46 million backlog in construction of needed roadway facilities and a \$76 million backlog in maintenance of existing roadways.

5. Poorly planned or unregulated development in the vicinity of existing aviation facilities can

³ San Diego Association of Governments, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan, p. 161.

result in future conflicts between incompatible land uses.

Discussion: When new development occurs in the vicinity of existing aviation facilities without sufficient consideration of the potential impacts, incompatibility of land uses may occur. Impacts such as noise and the potential hazard from crashes must be considered during land use planning reviews to ensure the health and safety of the public and to eliminate opposition to airport operations by surrounding residents. An airport's comprehensive land use plan identifies and recommends land use types that would be compatible with the airport use. The plan is intended to prevent the development of incompatible land uses and creation of hazards. Development projects are reviewed to ensure compatibility with both the current and future plans for the airport. For airports that do not yet have an adopted comprehensive land use plan, SANDAG's Airport Land Use Commission reviews all actions, regulations, and permits within the vicinity of the airport.⁴

6. Bicycle facilities in the unincorporated area have traditionally been developed at a slow rate.

Discussion: Over the past 10 years, an average of 4 miles of bikeways have been built annually in the unincorporated area. This level is below the rate of bikeway development that would be needed for the County to contribute its fair share toward meeting SANDAG's goal of increasing regional bikeway mileage by 30 miles per year. This is due in large part to a lack of funding sources, a lack of education programs to encourage cycling as an alternate mode of transportation, and a lack of emphasis on the development of bicycle facilities. In recent years, an increased emphasis has been placed on the development of bicycle facilities, and in FY 89-90, approximately 15 miles of bikeways were projected to be constructed in the unincorporated area. Publicity and educational programs directed at potential cyclists as well as motorists would encourage use of the bicycle as an alternative to the car.

⁴ As used in this section, "vicinity" means land that will be included or reasonably could be included within an airport's comprehensive land use plan. If a designated study area for the plan has not been identified, then "vicinity" means land within two miles of the boundary of a public airport.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

A SAFE, CONVENIENT, AND ECONOMICAL INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INCLUDING A WIDE RANGE OF TRANSPORTATION MODES.

OBJECTIVE 1:

A Level of Service "C" or better on County Circulation Element roads.

Policy 1.1: New development shall provide needed roadway expansion and improvements on-site to meet the demand created by the development, and to maintain a Level of Service "C" on Circulation Element Roads during peak traffic hours. New development shall provide off-site improvements designed to contribute to the overall achievement of a Level of Service "D" on Circulation Element Roads.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Review all development proposals to determine both their short-term and long-term impacts on the roadway system. The area of impact will be determined based on the size, type and location of the project; the traffic generated by the project; and the existing circulation and development pattern in the area. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Require, as a condition of approval of discretionary projects, improvements or other measures necessary to mitigate traffic impacts to avoid reduction in the existing Level of Service below "C" on on-site Circulation Element roads except within the Otay Ranch project as defined in the Otay Subregional Plan Text, Volume 2. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Require, as a condition of approval of discretionary projects which have a significant impact on roadways, improvements or other measures necessary to mitigate traffic impacts to avoid reduction in the existing Level of Service below "D" on off-site and on-site abutting Circulation Element roads. New development that would significantly impact congestion on roads at LOS "E" or "F", either currently or as a result of the project, will be denied unless improvements are scheduled to increase the LOS to "D" or better or appropriate mitigation is provided. Appropriate mitigation would include a fair share contribution in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to an established program or project. If impacts cannot be mitigated, the project will be denied unless a specific statement of overriding findings is made pursuant to Section 15091(b) and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Whenever possible on development proposals, require that access to parcels adjacent to roads shown on the Circulation Element be limited to side streets in order to maintain through traffic flow. [DPW, DPLU]

Policy 1.2: General Plan Amendments and Rezones shall be reviewed to ensure that any proposed increases in density or intensity of use will not prevent the planned Circulation Element road system

from operating at its planned Level of Service at buildout.

OBJECTIVE 2:

Equitable sharing of funding for transportation facilities.

Policy 2.1: New development shall be required to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Apply the Bridge and Thoroughfare Fee to all areas of the County and/or establish an unincorporated area traffic impact fee to support construction of the Circulation Element roadway and bikeway system in the unincorporated area to the extent necessitated by new development. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Assist and support the development of a regional transportation impact fee to finance regional transportation improvements necessitated by new development. [DPLU, DPW]

Policy 2.2: The County will actively work to reduce existing transportation facilities deficiencies.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Seek new and additional sources of funding to help finance improvements and maintenance of County transportation facilities. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Seek the County's fair share of state transportation bond issues, Proposition A sales tax funds, and other state and federal funding programs. [DPW]

OBJECTIVE 3:

A transportation system that is coordinated and integrated with the transportation facilities and plans of surrounding jurisdictions.

POLICY 3.1: The expansion of County transportation facilities will be coordinated with transportation plans of adjacent jurisdictions.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Coordinate with other jurisdictions in the review of planned transportation routes and facilities of regional or subregional importance to ensure compatibility between County, city and state plans. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Refer all discretionary development projects within city spheres of influence, within 1 mile of a city boundary, or within a city's designated planning review area to the appropriate city for a determination of the impact on city transportation facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Establish a cooperative mechanism to reconcile differences

between the County Circulation Element and that of neighboring cities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.4: Provide input to SANDAG during the development of regional transportation plans. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.5: Coordinate with CalTrans in the review of planned improvements to State highways to ensure conformance to State requirements. [DPW, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Reduction in the demand on the road system through increased public use of alternate forms of transportation or other means.

Policy 4.1: The use of alternate forms of transportation such as public transit and car/van pools will be supported and encouraged to reduce both roadway congestion and pollution.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: In areas where there are likely to be a large number of prospective users, coordinate the planning of all new transit routes or route changes with established development patterns and land use plans to efficiently serve existing and future transit generators. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 4.1.2: Work cooperatively with other jurisdictions and public transportation agencies, including the Metropolitan Transit Development Board and the North County Transit District, to provide a coordinated and integrated transit service network, including completion of the regional transit centers program. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.1.3: Consider the inclusion of public restrooms in the construction of new transit centers. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.1.4: Seek to increase transit service funds consistent with population growth and passenger demand. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.1.5: Site County facilities in close proximity to transit corridors, when feasible. [DGS, CAO, DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.1.6: Establish incentive programs for employers to encourage their employees to utilize alternate forms of transportation. [DPW, DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 4.1.7: Encourage employers to:

- a) provide employees with subsidized transit passes;
- b) establish carpool programs;
- c) provide vehicles for employee van-pools;
- d) provide preferential carpool parking;
- e) provide secure storage facilities, showers and lockers to encourage employees

- to use bicycles;
 - f) use flex-time and staggered work hours;
 - g) allow employees to telecommute from home or satellite offices; and
 - h) participate in the commuter computer program.
- [DPW, DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 4.1.8: Develop fiscal and other incentives to promote the use of multi-modal means of transportation (e.g., bicycling to park-and-ride facilities). [DPW, DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 4.1.9: Encourage pedestrian movement through urban design techniques, creating pedestrian-friendly environments and proper land use mix. [DPLU]

Policy 4.2: The County will ensure the development of its bikeway system and encourage its use.

Implementation Measure 4.2.1: Condition the approval of new development on dedication and construction of bikeways as indicated in the Circulation Element's Bicycle Network Plan. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.2.2: Construct bikeways in areas where there are potentially large numbers of prospective users. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.2.3: Acquire cost-effective rights-of-way and/or negotiate for the use of existing rights-of-way or easements for bikeways (e.g., abandoned railroad rights-of-way, pipeline/ powerline easements, flood control channels). [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 4.2.4: Provide bicycle-carrying racks on public transportation vehicles when a need is demonstrated. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.2.5: Require secure bicycle storage facilities at new commercial centers, public centers, industrial centers, transit centers, airports and multi-family developments. [DPLU, DPW]

Policy 4.3: Consider the need for transit improvements in Large Scale Projects.

Implementation Measure 4.3.1: Refer applications for Large Scale Projects to the County Transit System for recommendations on transit facility needs. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.3.2: Condition the approval of Large Scale Projects on the provision of accessible transit stops and other transit related improvements, as appropriate. [DPLU, DPW]

Policy 4.4: Ensure the provision of bicycle facilities and other needed bikeway related improvements in new development.

Implementation Measure 4.4.1: Refer applications for Large Scale Projects to the County Bikeway Coordinator for recommendations on requirements for the provision of bikeway facilities to serve the project. [DPLU, DPW]

OBJECTIVE 5:

Assurance of compatible land uses around County airports.

Policy 5.1: The County will ensure that land uses surrounding County airports are compatible with the operation of the airport.

Implementation Measure 5.1.1: Complete the development of Comprehensive Land Use Plans for each County airport. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 5.1.2: Review all applications for discretionary projects, building permit applications, general plan amendments and rezones located within the boundaries of an airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for compatibility with the plan as a basis for project approval. [DPW, DPLU]

SECTION 5. FLOOD CONTROL

OVERVIEW

Although the San Diego region on the average receives less than 11 inches of rain annually, the extensive river and stream system makes the threat of flooding a serious concern. Bedrock outcrops, hard-packed ground and steep slopes found throughout much of the County result in a large volume of surface runoff which increases the danger of flooding. Urbanization also results in an increase both in localized concentration of storm water and in the rate at which this water runs off. To protect property and the public health, safety and welfare, it is necessary to ensure that adequate flood control facilities are in place.

Several types of flood control measures can be utilized to reduce the threat posed by floods. One method is to increase the capacity of natural channels by straightening, lining or deepening. Another method is to install underground storm drains to carry the flow. Dams and reservoirs constructed for the storage of water can also provide flood containment and reduce flood flows in downstream rivers. Channel improvements, storm drains, dams and reservoirs, and development controls are all utilized in some instances by the County to reduce the risk of flooding. However, the most effective method of flood control is the control of development in floodplains¹. Through zoning and other regulations, the construction of structures or improvements within floodplains can be limited or prohibited.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

The County of San Diego is the agency responsible for providing flood control in the unincorporated area, through the San Diego County Flood Control District. When originally formed, the District was divided into six geographic zones based on watershed boundaries. Each zone had its own advisory commission and levied taxes independently of the other zones. In the early 1980's, the use of zones was discontinued, and since then the District has operated as a single entity with one advisory commission for the entire District. With the Board of Supervisors as its Board of Directors, the District provides or ensures the provision of flood control improvements in the unincorporated area of the County.

¹ A floodplain is the relatively flat area of low lands adjoining, and including, the channel of a river, stream, watercourse, or other body of water which is subject to inundation by the flood waters of the one-hundred year frequency flood.

EXISTING FLOOD CONTROL METHODS

The primary method of flood control utilized by San Diego County is the prevention of development within floodplains. Preventing development within floodplains alleviates the need to provide costly flood control facilities to protect the development within the floodplain.

To regulate, and in some cases prevent, development within the floodplain, the County has undertaken a floodplain and alluvial fan² mapping program. Under this program the one hundred year flood hazard area is mapped in watersheds that are not heavily developed. Construction within these mapped areas is then regulated, avoiding the need for costly flood control improvements. While the cost of mapping one mile of floodplain is approximately \$12,000, the cost of constructing one mile of a channel facility can be between \$1 million and \$20 million.

Approximately 200 miles of rivers and streams and 35 miles of alluvial fans in the unincorporated area of San Diego County had been mapped through 1989. Included in the mapped areas are 5 rivers (San Diego, San Luis Rey, San Dieguito, Sweetwater and Otay Rivers) and 30 streams. In addition, 55 streams and alluvial fans were being mapped in 1989, and an additional 60 streams will be mapped in the future.

Development has already occurred, however, in a number of the County's floodplains. In these areas large-scale flood control improvements (i.e., concrete or rip-rap channels) are sometimes needed. In 1990, there were three large-scale flood control facilities in the unincorporated area: Los Coches Creek, Spring Valley Creek and Rams Hill. The Los Coches Creek flood control facility consists of approximately two miles of a rectangular concrete channel built in the creek bed. The main portion of the Spring Valley Creek facility contains one mile of concrete channel and one mile of an underground concrete box pipe. The third facility, located around the Rams Hill development southeast of Borrego Springs, is located on an alluvial fan. Levees, channels and diversion walls were constructed to divert the flow around the Rams Hill development. Figure 5-A shows the locations of the mapped floodplains and the locations of the three major flood control facilities in the unincorporated area.

To avoid the need to build facilities of large scale and cost, the County prohibits development in the floodway and regulates development within floodplains. The intent is to ensure that new development does not create the need for large-scale concrete or riprap flood control channels.

² An alluvial fan is a stream that "fans out" upon reaching the plain rather than flowing in a defined channel.

FIGURE 5-A GOES HERE

Flood control/drainage facilities required to be provided by developers, if deemed necessary through project review, are generally of a smaller scale than the facilities built in Los Coches Creek and Spring Valley Creek. Conditions can be placed on discretionary permits requiring the provision of adequate flood control facilities. Through the use of grading techniques, storm drains, gutters and the careful selection of vegetation, localized flooding is prevented.

When a development project is of significant size and will have a substantial effect on the regional flood control infrastructure, major on-site and off-site flood control improvements may be required. Developers may also be required to upgrade existing flood control facilities (e.g., storm drain pipes) when larger capacity facilities are needed.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVEL

Over 10 miles of open channel flood control facilities and 30 miles of underground storm drains are owned and maintained by the County. The Flood Control Comprehensive Plans that have been developed include both needed improvements to existing facilities and needed new facilities throughout the unincorporated County. These Plans also include an estimate of the cost of construction for each facility. In 1990, over \$150 million in flood control improvements were identified in the plans.

FUNDING METHODS

Funding flood control improvements is becoming increasingly difficult. As revenue sources have been exhausted, the County has had to develop alternate methods of financing improvements and expansion of flood control infrastructure.

GRANTS

When available, grant funds are used primarily to finance major flood control capital facility projects. The primary source of grant funding for flood control purposes is the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

The Army Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service are two other potential sources of grant funds. To receive grant funding from either of these sources, a project must meet specific criteria, including the size and the cost-benefit ratio of the project. Most projects are too small to meet the criteria. The County received approximately \$4 million from the Army Corps of Engineers to help finance the Los Coches Creek facility.

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Drainage Fees

The County currently uses the County Drainage Fee Ordinance to assess a development impact fee on new land divisions for the construction costs of drainage and flood control facilities that benefit the property. Established under the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66483), the fee is applied only to subdivision projects. Fees are assessed per acre or per lot, based on the total cost of recommended improvements in the flood basin containing the proposed project.

Additionally, the County may charge applicants requesting a rezone or a major use permit an impact fee for flood control and drainage improvements.

Flood Control District Fees

In July of 1989, the County began utilizing the Flood Control District Fee Ordinance in the Spring Valley/Casa De Oro area. This fee was established under Sections 17.1 and 17.5 of the San Diego County Flood Control District Act (Water Uncodified Acts Section 6914A). Using the Flood Control District authority, drainage/flood control fees can be assessed on all new buildings contributing to the need for facilities, not just new subdivisions. The fee is based on the total cost of needed flood control improvements located in the special drainage area in which a project is proposed, and is assessed based on total square footage of the buildings. In 1989, the fee had been adopted only for the Spring Valley and Casa De Oro area, however; it is intended to eventually replace the drainage fee program established under the Subdivision Map Act.

PROPERTY TAXES

The County Flood Control District receives a small portion of the 1% property tax in four of the original Flood Control District Zones and in a portion of Fallbrook. Of every \$100 of tax revenues received, the Flood Control District receives approximately \$.80. These funds offset operational costs as well as fund, to a minor extent, the construction of flood control facilities.

FLOOD CONTROL CONSTRUCTION BY DEVELOPERS

In addition to drainage fees, developers may be required to install flood control facilities both on-site and off-site to mitigate the impacts of a project. In some cases, the County requires drainage facilities to have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated increased runoff from planned or developed property upstream from the developer's property.

COUNTY ROAD FUND

County Road Fund monies are used to finance flood control and drainage improvements such as storm drains, gutters, and drainage culverts that are located in road rights-of-way.

ISSUES

- 1. The need to protect an area from flooding often conflicts with the protection of environmental resources in a floodplain.**

Discussion: Historically, development has occurred in and along rivers and other natural channels in what is now recognized as 100-year floodplains. Consequently, floodplains often contain historical and archaeological resources. Additionally, floodplains typically contain sensitive biological habitats such as riparian woodlands, wetlands, and other concentrations of plants and animals. If the natural watercourses are shifted in these floodplains, the sensitive habitats and resources can be seriously affected.

In San Diego County, a number of homes and commercial structures have been built in floodplains and are at hazard from floods. These structures are generally located in existing urbanized areas, and were constructed before proper floodplain management procedures were required. In order to adequately and cost-effectively protect these areas, the provision of flood control facilities is typically required. This need often conflicts with the environmental value of the conservation and protection of natural watercourses.

- 2. Funding mechanisms to finance new facilities are inadequate to meet current needs.**

Discussion: The funding of flood control facilities is becoming increasingly difficult. Currently, the Flood Control Comprehensive Plans include over \$150 million in costs for needed facilities. Only \$1 million to \$3 million is spent on the construction of flood control facilities by the Flood Control District each year. Even with the facilities that are built by developers or funded from drainage fees and grants, little significant headway is being made toward constructing necessary flood control facilities.

- 3. Provision of flood control facilities is sometimes opposed because of the perception that such facilities are growth-inducing.**

Discussion: Once flood control facilities have been constructed, affected properties that are no longer at risk from flooding are more likely to be developed. As a result, flood control facilities are often considered to be growth-inducing, and are resisted by many communities. Conflicts can occur between the desires of a community and the need to construct flood control facilities to protect existing structures.

4. Sand mining in rivers affects the need for flood control facilities.

Discussion: Sand extraction results in large pits that can significantly change the flow characteristics of rivers during flood conditions. As a result of changes in flow characteristics, the outer edge of an extraction area can experience major erosion or a change in river patterns can occur. This can undermine bridges, wash out river banks and result in the need for major flood control facilities to stabilize the river.

When properly planned and designed, projects that include sand extraction can improve flood control and river stabilization. An example of this is the Upper San Diego River Improvement Project (USDRIP). This project, which includes sand extraction in the river, will provide environmentally sound flood protection through a natural floodway and the location of flood control structures outside of sensitive habitat areas. The development of reclamation plans and their phased implementation once areas are mined will alleviate conflicts between the need for flood control and the extraction of sand resources located within floodplains.

5. The County Drainage Fee Ordinance does not generate enough funds to construct needed facilities.

Discussion: Since the County Drainage Fee Ordinance applies only to subdivisions, and can only finance those improvements needed because of the new development, it does not generate sufficient funds to construct all needed facilities. For example, much development (such as apartments, light industrial, and shopping centers) occurs under a building permit and does not require subdivision, and hence does not pay drainage fees. In urbanized areas the problem is compounded, because most development that does occur typically needs only a building permit. Therefore, no drainage fees are collected, and additionally, significant facility deficiencies often exist regardless of new development. Consequently, the drainage facility inadequacies found in many older urbanized areas remain unfunded.

A major restriction on the use of drainage fees is the requirement that they be spent in the sub-drainage area in which they are collected. With over 80 sub-

drainage areas, only small amounts of fees are usually collected from any one area, making it difficult to fund and construct large projects.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY IN AREAS SUBJECT TO FLOODING.

GOAL

PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION OF FLOODWAYS IN THEIR NATURAL STATE.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Reduction in the need for construction of flood control structures.

Policy 1.1: Development within floodplains will be restricted to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for channels and other flood control facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Map floodplains to identify flood prone areas, particularly in rapidly developing communities. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: As detailed in County ordinances, prohibit development in floodways, except as needed for the health, safety, and welfare of the public, and regulate development in floodplain fringes. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Incorporate floodplain management policies into the Community Plan update process. [DPLU, DPW]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Preservation of the floodplain environment from adverse impacts due to development.

Policy 2.1: The use of natural channels will be required except in cases where no less environmentally damaging alternative is appropriate.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Ensure that the design, siting and location of new development does not create a need for flood control facilities that result in negative environmental impacts. [DPW, DPLU]

Policy 2.2: The County will require sand mining activities to provide environmentally compatible flood protection structures as necessary to prevent adverse impacts to adjacent properties.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Work with the sand and gravel industry, environmental groups, and planning groups to develop a regionwide policy to identify and designate regionally significant mineral resources, and coordinate flood control, environmental, public health and safety, and other needs as appropriate. [DPLU, DPW]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Expeditious approval and construction of environmentally sensitive flood control facilities when they are necessary.

Policy 3.1: The County will ensure that interested parties have the opportunity to provide input into a flood control project to conduct a timely and complete project review.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Work closely with agencies reviewing projects (e.g. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, State Department of Fish and Game, California Coastal Commission) to ensure timely receipt of environmental and planning information. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Coordinate with cities when planned facilities or their impacts extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries. [DPW]

Policy 3.2: The County will pursue the timely processing of applications for necessary permits.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Submit applications for necessary permits (e.g., Clean Water Act Section 4 Permit, Endangered Species Act Section 10A Permit) at the earliest possible point. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Work closely with involved agencies (e.g., Army Corps of Engineers, State Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Coastal Commission) to identify and ensure the expeditious processing of all needed permits. [DPW]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Equitable financing of needed flood control facilities.

Policy 4.1: The costs of constructing needed flood control facilities shall be shared by property owners who create the need for, and benefit from, the facilities.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Develop and utilize funding mechanisms such as drainage fees, assessment districts, County Service Areas and Flood Control District subzones to finance design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of needed facilities. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 4.1.2: Establish a County ordinance to require new development to construct needed flood control facilities and/or to pay drainage fees based on each project's fair share of the needed improvements. [DPW]

OBJECTIVE 5:

Reduction in the adverse impacts created by storm water run-off from urban areas.

Policy 5.1: The County will require measures to decrease the adverse impacts created by increased quantity and degradation in quality of runoff from urban areas.

Implementation Measure 5.1.1: Review development projects to identify potential impacts from increased quantity or velocity of runoff from proposed improvements (e.g., parking lots, rooftops, storm drains) and require necessary improvements needed to mitigate the adverse impacts. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 5.1.2: Review development projects to determine potential degradation of the quality of storm water runoff, and require measures to mitigate any negative impacts. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 5.1.3: In order to protect local water supplies from pollutants carried by storm water runoff:

- a) identify watersheds in danger of degradation from surface water runoff from new development; and
- b) require any necessary protection or runoff diversion systems needed to safeguard the water supply as a condition of development. [DPW,

DPLU]

Implementation Measure 5.1.4: Provide information and recommendations to the Environmental Protection Agency during the preparation and review phases of Federal water quality control regulations. [DPW]

Section 6. Solid Waste

OVERVIEW

Solid waste is an unavoidable result of the production and consumption of goods. The State Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act of 1972 conferred the primary responsibility for solid waste management upon local governments, subject to the regulatory authority of certain state boards and agencies mandated to carry out specific aspects of enforcement. The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 retained that arrangement, but enlarged the responsibilities of cities to provide integrated waste management.

There are a number of ways to dispose the refuse and to reduce the amount that is produced. Land disposal has traditionally been the primary method of handling the County's solid waste. Early open pits were replaced by incineration; by the 1980's, most waste was placed in sanitary landfills. Emphasis has now shifted towards the integration of recycling, source reduction and landfilling. California's Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 calls for recycling of 25% of waste materials by 1995, and 50% by 2000.

Requirements to increase recycling stem from the growing concern of the disadvantages of landfilling. Leachate and gas leakage (both atmospheric emissions and off-site underground migration) from landfills can cause problems for future generations. In addition, it is increasingly recognized that solid waste contains valuable materials which can be profitably recycled. The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires the County and cities to produce an Integrated Waste Management Plan, which must be updated regularly.

Solid waste management regulations are found in the United States Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989; Titles 14 (as amended by the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989). 22 and 23 of the California Administrative Code of Regulations; and in the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Currently, the San Diego region is served by nine sanitary landfill sites, five of which are the property of the County and administered by the County Department of Public Works (Borrego Springs, Ramona, Otay, San Marcos and Sycamore). Two sites are under the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego and three are the property of the United States Marine Corps at Camp Pendleton. The City of San Diego operates its landfills with its own work force. The County and Marine Corps contract with a private company to perform the daily landfill operations. (See Figure 6-A.)

Figure 6-A

Residents of the unincorporated area of the County can bring household garbage and refuse to any of ten rural transfer stations located at Barrett Junction, Boulevard, Campo, Julian, Ocotillo Wells, Vallecito, Palomar Mountain, Ranchita, Sunshine Summit and Viejas. Alternatively, residents can contract with private haulers to pick up their refuse, as businesses are required to do.

With the increased emphasis on reducing the amount of waste disposed of in landfills, over 25 recycling centers have been created.

Virtually all solid waste generated in the region is stored and disposed in facilities under the jurisdiction of either the County or the City of San Diego. The two jurisdictions have attempted to adopt uniform disposal fees so that wastes are taken to the nearest or most accessible site. The United States Marine Corps disposes of its own waste, with the exception of demolition materials generated from construction projects on Camp Pendleton, which are usually disposed of in County landfills (waste from other military bases is disposed of at City and County facilities).

The County has been designated the solid waste planning and management agency for the region. The San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Task Force, consisting of representatives of the County and each of the region's cities, is responsible for updating and implementing the State-mandated Integrated Waste Management Plan. The County Department of Public Works is serving as staff to the Integrated Waste Management Task Force. In addition, the County is responsible for overall solid waste planning and regulatory control in the unincorporated areas of the County.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

The primary permits for solid waste facilities located anywhere in the region are issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County Department of Health Services (this latter has been designated the Local Enforcement Agency by the State). The County Department of Health Services is responsible for regular inspection of solid waste facilities; it is also the local review agency of the disposal of health-related solid waste storage and disposal through the region. Hazardous Waste Disposal facilities are discussed in another section of this Element.

The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for maintaining the quality of coastal, surface and groundwater in the region. It must approve proposed solid waste disposal sites through Waste Discharge Permits to protect against water pollution and is also involved in regulating the closure of filled landfill sites. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (a dependent special district whose board of directors is the County Board of Supervisors) is responsible for the monitoring of air quality and enforcing state and federal air quality requirements.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Most types of public facilities, if properly maintained and enhanced to meet changing needs, can be used for decades. In contrast, landfill sites have a projected closure date when no additional capacity for waste disposal remains. The predicted closure date varies, depending on the growth or decrease in projected population, volume produced per capita and the permitted expansion possibilities of the existing sites.

If no new facilities are added, nor additional efforts to reduce waste implemented, the County will run out of solid waste disposal capacity by the turn of the century. Even if the volume of waste to be disposed of is reduced by the predicted amount, capacity is increased in existing landfills, and waste-to-energy processing is instituted, no space will remain in any of the currently existing disposal sites in about 20 years.

In 1990, the county was doing a number of things to address this problem. These included the consideration of three potential sites for a new North County landfill and investigation of sites in the southern part of the County, expansion of the San Marcos landfill to add several years' capacity, and promotion of a proposal to site several transfer stations. In addition, recycling, as well as the consideration of a waste-to-energy plant in San Marcos, would reduce the volume of waste to be disposed of in landfills.

Landfill site closure plans must meet all current state- and federally-mandated guidelines for waste containment, precipitation and drainage controls, leachate collection and removal systems and monitoring program requirements. In 1990 there were approximately 60 inactive landfill sites in the County; while they had been filled completely, most had not undergone formal closure procedures.

FUNDING METHODS

SOLID WASTE ENTERPRISE FUND

Currently, solid waste program costs are supported entirely from tipping fees which are placed in the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund. A portion of these funds are set aside for new facilities, closing costs for existing facilities, ongoing maintenance and recycling.

A portion of service charges, fees against property, and/or development impact fees could be used to fund facility expansion and new facility development. State loans and grants may be available for specific programs. The County is also exploring the use of revenue bonds to fund new solid waste facilities.

The Enterprise Fund was established in 1981-82 to maintain and acquire waste disposal facilities through tipping fees collected at landfills, permit fees from licensed haulers using County facilities, and leases of Enterprise Fund property. However, revenues needed to pay off the debt are not guaranteed unless cities agree to direct all their waste to landfills for the duration of the debt payback period.

ISSUES

1. There is an accelerating increase in the need for solid waste disposal facilities.

Discussion: In the future, if current trends continue, new landfill disposal sites will be needed because of:

- Increases in population (projected to grow by 47.7% between 1985 and 2010);
- Attainment of full capacity at existing sites;
- Increases in the per capita production of waste in California. From 1975 to 1985, production increased from 1.067 tons per capita to 1.455 tons per capita, equivalent to a 2.6% increase annually.

As a consequence, new landfill facilities serving all parts of the County are needed.

2. Integrated waste management facility¹ siting is often controversial because such facilities are perceived to produce negative impacts.

Discussion: The selection of an integrated waste management facility site is a lengthy procedure. Residents of the area in which a site is proposed are often concerned with impacts such as increase traffic, litter, dust, drainage problems and visual blight that potentially could be caused by the facility. Consequently, there is frequently community opposition to siting these facilities. Once a location is selected, it typically takes at least four years to undergo review, obtain permits, construct the facility and begin operation.

Depending on their location and design, sanitary landfill sites may have a negative impact on valuable groundwater basins. If a landfill were to be sited within a groundwater basin and leaked, there could be a contamination. Toxins, acids and other pollutants might escape from a landfill and percolate into the basin. It would be important to design the facility to be leakproof and to provide for perpetual post-closure monitoring and maintenance of the site.

¹ State law defines both sanitary landfill sites and recycling centers as integrated waste management facilities.

3. The siting of integrated waste management facilities requires the participation of city governments.

In some cases, it may be appropriate to site waste disposal facilities within a city. Section 50000.5 of the Public Resources Code requires that such facilities be consistent with a city's General Plan. Time delays and potential opposition from host jurisdictions can create problems in siting these facilities in the locations most appropriate to serve the region's rapidly expanding population. While the County may not be subject to city zoning and building regulations or the requirements to obtain permits, it is desirable to coordinate with cities on the siting of integrated waste management facilities. A cooperative mechanism to include all jurisdictions is needed to jointly plan, when possible, the siting of these facilities.

4. State law and County policy require the implementation of alternative treatment scenarios to reduce the need for landfills.

Discussion: In 1989, the State Legislature passed a number of pertinent laws modifying the Government Code, the Health and Safety Code, the Public Resources Code and other statutes that create a set of state programs designed to increase recycling and encourage the development of markets for recyclable materials. They include Stats. 1989, Chap. 1094 (Assembly Bill 4: Public Contract Code, Section 12150 et seq. and other Sections of the Public Contract Code); Stats. 1989, Chap. 1093 (Assembly Bill 1305: Public Resources Code 1600 et seq.); and Stats. 1989, Chap. 1096 (Senate Bill 1322: Public Resources Code, Section 40100 et seq.).

In addition, Stats. 1989, Chap. 1095 (Assembly Bill 939: Public Resources Code 40000 et seq. and other code sections) establishes a comprehensive state policy for solid waste management which emphasizes source reduction, recycling and composting as priorities for handling solid waste over incineration technologies and landfilling.

This law, known as the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, became effective January 1, 1990. It made the following modifications to procedures:

- Replaced existing County Solid Waste Management Plans with an Integrated Waste Management Plan, which redefined the role of the County and gave a greater responsibility for the management and disposal of solid waste to cities in the region;

- Revised the duties of cities and counties relating to permits, inspection and regulation of solid waste facilities, in order to reduce the need for conventional solid waste land disposal;
- Required that by 1995, 25% of all solid waste must be reduced and diverted through source reduction and recycling processes; by 2000, 50% of the solid waste will have to be reduced and diverted; and
- Allowed for the imposition of fines on cities or counties that fail to adopt and implement a waste management plan.

The result will be a reduction in the emphasis on capacity for solid waste disposal and a shift to other facilities such as collection centers (to store materials before recycling); transformation facilities to recover gas, energy, and/or materials; scrap metal salvaging plants; and recycling centers. However, it is acknowledged that, even with maximum recycling and waste-to-energy processing, for the foreseeable future there will still be a need for landfills.

5. There is a need for appropriate closure procedures and acceptable reuse of landfill sites that have already reached capacity.

Discussion: State and federal laws include detailed monitoring requirements to ensure that filled landfill sites do not discharge hazardous byproducts. Closure planning, to ensure no dangerous discharge occurs and to identify acceptable uses of closed landfill sites, is of utmost importance. Existing state regulations specify how to properly prepare formal landfill closure plans. Some filled landfill sites that were closed before these regulations were adopted, will require monitoring and additional treatment.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

MINIMIZE RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SOLID WASTE GENERATED IN THE COUNTY AT ITS SOURCE.

GOAL

THE SAFE, SANITARY AND ENVIROMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE COLLECTION, STORAGE, TRANSPORT, RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL OF THE SOLID WASTE THAT IS GENERATED.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Reduce the volume of waste to be landfilled by 30% by 1992 (County-mandated objective) and by 50% by 2000 (State-mandated).

Policy 1.1: The County will promote waste management techniques that are alternative to landfilling.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Develop public information programs stressing the need for recycling. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Enlarge the existing network of recycling centers to ensure that County residents can drop off all kinds of products for recycling. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Work with the cities to develop ordinances regionwide that would requiring source reduction measures to eliminate unnecessary packaging. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Evaluate The Zoning Ordinance and other County ordinances, codes and policies to ensure the appropriate regulation of all types of waste management facilities. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Seek funding for urban resource recovery projects that result in production of energy, animal food sources or other useful by-products. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.6: Develop a Board of Supervisors policy requiring the County to purchase products containing recycled and recyclable materials whenever feasible and the expansion of recycling and source reduction programs at County sites. [DPW, DPC]

Implementation Measure 1.1.7: Support the efforts of other public and private groups to establish conservation and recycling programs. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.8: Implement the policies and recommendations of the Integrated Waste Management Plan dealing with alternative waste management techniques. [DPW, DPLU]

Policy 1.2: Landfills shall be used primarily for wastes that cannot be recycled or processed and for the residual waste from processing facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Condition the approval of large scale projects and planned developments on the inclusion of on-site storage to separate recyclable solid waste. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Encourage all the cities of the region to provide recycling and disposal capacity for the waste generated by their residents or monetary equivalent, and to require the provision of separated waste storage in residential, commercial and industrial projects. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.3: Promote alternatives to landfills (e.g., small-scale composting operations). [DPW, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

A sufficient number of solid waste disposal sites to accommodate existing and future need.

Policy 2.1: In conjunction with the cities of the region, the County will encourage the establishment of facilities for the disposal of inert materials and special wastes such as sludge and non-hazardous liquids.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Provide technical expertise to identify appropriate sites for the disposal of inert materials and special wastes. Work with cities, special districts and other agencies to ensure the environmental analysis, selection and acquisition of those sites, as needed. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Cooperate with agencies providing sewer service to identify appropriate recycling and disposal alternatives for sludge materials. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.1.3: Expand existing landfills when possible so that available landfill capacity is increased. [DPW]

Policy 2.2: In conjunction with the cities of the region, the County will continue to identify and acquire sites appropriate for the disposal of waste products and waste residuals which cannot be recycled, converted to energy, or otherwise used.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: To ensure that the negative impacts of any selected site are minimized, include the evaluation of the following types of criteria in the site selection process for solid waste facilities:

- a) Location;
- b) Access;
- c) Geology and Seismology;
- d) Groundwater and Other Environmental Constraints;
- e) Physical Constraints;
- f) Economic Constraints;
- g) Availability of property; and
- h) Community impacts.

[DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Establish a committee, not to exceed 15 members, of permitting agencies, interested parties and community groups to participate in the development and weighing of criteria to rank proposed sites for solid waste facilities. The committee will meet early in the siting process before any actual sites have been identified in order to assure an unbiased review of the draft criteria. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.2.3: Coordinate the timely siting and operation of landfill sites with the federal government (e.g., U.S. Marine Corps), the City of San Diego and other affected agencies (e.g., Regional Water Quality Control Board). [DPW]

Implementation Measure 2.2.4: Monitor sanitary landfill and other waste management facilities to ensure they do not threaten sources of groundwater supplies. [DPW, DHS]

Implementation Measure 2.2.5: When appropriate, reserve portions of closed landfill facilities to accommodate future needs for yard waste composting and recycling facilities. [DPW]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Minimize, or mitigate, the environmental impacts of solid waste disposal sites.

Policy 3.1: The County will reduce the impacts of operational landfill sites.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Ensure detailed review of active solid waste management sites prior to reuse through their designation in a Solid Waste Management Facility Overlay Zone. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Review discretionary projects planned for sites adjacent to proposed and existing solid waste facilities for compatibility with the landfill site. [DPLU]

Policy 3.2: The County will reduce the impacts of sanitary landfill sites after they reach capacity.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Ensure the monitoring and rehabilitation of solid waste disposal sites that either have reached capacity or for other reasons are no longer suitable or desirable for waste disposal operations. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Ensure that any reuse of a landfill site which has undergone the formal closure process is suitable for the site and consistent with the Community or Subregional Plan. Rezone completed sites to apply the Solid Waste Management Facility Overlay Zone. [DPLU]

SECTION 7. LAW ENFORCEMENT

OVERVIEW

Law enforcement services are mandated by State law in order to protect lives and property and to ensure a safe and peaceful environment. This is accomplished by reducing opportunities for crime, resolving conflicts, and identifying, arresting and prosecuting criminals. Basic law enforcement services include pro-active patrol to deter, observe and arrest perpetrators of criminal activity, response to public requests for service, and investigations of crimes and incidents.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services to the County's unincorporated area and by contract to the cities of Del Mar, Encinitas, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista. Services include general patrol, traffic enforcement, criminal investigation, crime prevention, juvenile services, communications dispatch and various management support services.

As San Diego County's Chief Law Enforcement Officer, the Sheriff also provides regional law enforcement services for the entire county. These services include: investigation of homicide, arson and fraud, narcotics, child abuse, and vice cases; criminal laboratory; crime analysis; automated fingerprint identification; criminal recordkeeping and intelligence; aerial support to law enforcement agencies; emergency planning; and law enforcement training. The Sheriff also operates six County detention facilities.

The Sheriff's Department is organized into three basic programs: Law Enforcement Services, Detention Facility Services and Administrative Services. The Law Enforcement Services (LES) program performs all law enforcement functions throughout the Sheriff's jurisdiction. To effectively serve this vast geographic area, Law Enforcement Services is divided into seven divisions. Six of these divisions are based in urban areas: Encinitas, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, Poway, Santee, and Vista. The seventh division is the Rural Division, which covers the entire non-urban unincorporated area of the county. Figure 7-A shows the Sheriff's total jurisdiction and the geographic area served by each LES division. Table 7-1 lists the communities served by each LES division.

Each Division, except the Rural Division, serves the surrounding communities from a full-service Sheriff's station. The station provides all of the services listed above except the regional services, which are based in separate locations. Typically a Sheriff's station serves a population of 20,000 people or more.

FIGURE 8-A GOES HERE

**TABLE 7-1
SERVICE AREAS OF SHERIFF STATIONS IN 1989**

STATION LOCATION	SERVICE AREA
Encinitas	Cities of Encinitas, Solana Beach and Del Mar, the unincorporated communities of Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch and San Onofre.
Imperial Beach	City of Imperial Beach, and the unincorporated communities of Bonita, Otay Ranch and portions of East Otay Mesa.
Lemon Grove	City of Lemon Grove, and the unincorporated areas of Spring Valley, Casa de Oro, Rancho San Diego, La Mesa, El Cajon and Jamul.
Poway (Ramona Substation)	City of Poway and the unincorporated community of Ramona.
Santee (Alpine Substation)	City of Santee and the unincorporated communities of Lakeside, Crest, Blossom Valley, Dehesa and Alpine.
Vista (Fallbrook Substation)	Cities of Vista and San Marcos, and the unincorporated communities of Bonsall and Fallbrook.
Rural (Julian, Pine Valley, Campo/Tecate & Valley Center/Pauma Sub-stations) (Borrego, Boulevard/ Jacumba, Campo, Dulzura, Ranchita & Warner Springs Resident Offices)	East County portions of North and South County that are not covered by any of the above.

To provide better response to citizen calls for service, those divisions which cover large geographic areas, including the Rural Division, also contain Sheriff's substations. These facilities serve specified subareas within the division's area of responsibility and provide general law enforcement patrol, crime investigation and crime prevention services. In 1990 there were substations located in Alpine (Santee Division), Fallbrook (Vista Division), Julian (Rural Division), Pine Valley (Rural Division), Ramona (Poway Division), Tecate (Rural Division), and Valley Center/Pauma (Rural Division). Services not usually provided by a substation are provided by the station within the same Division.

The Sheriff's Department also has branch offices in several rural unincorporated areas. These offices provide general law enforcement patrol and crime investigation services on a more limited scale and are staffed by resident deputies. Currently, branch offices are located in Borrego, Boulevard, Campo, Dulzura, Ranchita and Warner Springs.

The operations of each of the Sheriff's facilities are augmented by the specialized services of the Law Enforcement Support Bureau facilities. These services are provided from facilities separate from the Law Enforcement Operations Bureau stations, substations and branch offices. The following table lists these facilities and the services provided from them.

**TABLE 7-2
LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT BUREAU FACILITIES AND SERVICES PROVIDED**

FACILITY	SERVICES PROVIDED
Central Investigations	Automated fingerprint identification, evidence and property, homicide investigation, arson/fraud investigation, crime lab, and crime scene investigation.
Communications	Computer-aided dispatch of all Sheriff's operational units.
Special Investigations	Criminal intelligence, vice investigation, narcotics investigation, and street drug and gang investigation.
Emergency Services	Aerial support, emergency planning, reserves/explorers, and special enforcement detail.
Juvenile Services	Juvenile diversion and child abuse investigation.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVEL

In 1989, the Sheriff operated facilities to accommodate a service level of one twenty-four hour unit (three patrol shifts per day) per 12,363 people in the urban unincorporated area. The level of patrol units per population, as well as other key factors, results in certain response times. Response time is the time it takes a unit to get to the scene of a crime from the moment a call for service is received. Response time is the most meaningful indicator of the adequacy of the level of service.

For the urban unincorporated area, the current minimally acceptable response time is 8 minutes or less for priority calls (i.e., calls involving life threatening situations or felonies in progress) and 16 minutes for non-priority calls. Quick response to calls is critical because it increases the chances of saving lives or apprehending criminals on or near the scene of the crime. In the first six months of 1989, average response time for priority calls was 13.9 minutes, and 24.3 minutes for non-priority calls.

For the rural unincorporated area, the Sheriff provided facilities in 1989 to accommodate a service level of one twenty-four hour unit (three patrol shifts per day) per 7,291 people. In this area, however, the size of the geographic area served, the road system, the sparse distribution of population and other factors particular to the rural area affect the response times to a greater extent than does the level of patrol units per population. For this area, the minimally acceptable response time for priority calls is 12 minutes, and 24 minutes for non-priority calls. During the first six months of 1989, the average response time for priority calls was 16.9 minutes, and 24.6 minutes for non-priority calls.

FUNDING METHODS

GENERAL FUND AND CITY CONTRACTS

The Sheriff's law enforcement facilities serving the unincorporated area have been funded from the General Fund. To the extent facilities are housing patrols serving cities, they have been funded by the contracts with cities. These contracts include some provisions for facility cost, but may not be fully offsetting all facility expansion costs.

STATE FUNDING

Surcharges on parking and non-parking fines and forfeitures authorized by the County Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction Fund (AB 189) generate additional revenues for capital projects including expansion and repair of existing facilities.

ISSUES

1. **Existing facility levels are inadequate to provide the desired level of protection to San Diego County residents.**

Discussion: Adequate facilities are those that are necessary to house the staff and equipment needed to provide responses to calls within 8 minutes for priority calls, and 16 minutes for non-priority calls in the urban unincorporated area. In 1989, the facility/service level in this area produced response times of 13.9 minutes for priority calls, and 24.3 minutes for non-priority calls. The number of twenty-four hour units per population in the urban unincorporated area is directly related to the ability of the Sheriff to provide adequate response times. Current response times based on the level of patrols per population are inadequate and must be improved.

2. **New development creates a need for expanded Sheriff facilities to serve the new population.**

Discussion: New development in both the unincorporated area and within contract cities will increase the population served by the Sheriff, leading to an increase in the number of calls for service and in the need for proactive patrol. Unless facilities are expanded to meet the needs of the new development, existing facility deficiencies will be exacerbated and response times will increase. To the extent new development causes a need for facility expansion, a development impact fee can be used to supplement the County/city general fund support. New development within the Sheriff's service area, including contract cities, should participate in such a program.

3. **The needs and measures of service (and hence facility) levels within the Rural Division cannot be measured by the same methods used for the urban unincorporated area.**

Discussion: The Sheriff's Rural Division serves the eastern, rural portion of the County. Unlike the urban unincorporated area, the size of the area served, the sparse distribution of population, the road system and other factors affect the response times and the adequacy of service in the rural area to a greater extent than the number of units per population. For these areas, the number of twenty-four hour units per population may not be an accurate gauge to use in assessing the adequacy of services and facilities since, for these areas, it does not directly affect response times. An alternate measure of facility/service adequacy should be developed for the rural area.

4. **Population growth in the contract cities is a factor contributing to the need for expansion of Sheriff facilities.**

Discussion: Growth due to new residential and commercial/ industrial development in the Sheriff's contract enforcement cities is a factor contributing to the need for construction or expansion of Sheriff's facilities. Although the contracts with these cities fully offset the capital costs of existing facilities, they do not provide funds to cover new construction or expansion costs due to new development. The cost of expanding or acquiring new facilities, to the extent that they serve city residents, should be passed along through the costs of the annual contract with the County.

5. **Multijurisdictional involvement is necessary in the siting of Sheriff's facilities.**

Discussion: Due to geographic, demographic and economic reasons, it may be appropriate to locate Sheriff's facilities within the boundaries of contract cities. These facilities serve the population of the affected cities as well as unincorporated area residents. While the County is not subject to city zoning and building regulations or the requirement to obtain city permits, the County should coordinate with cities on the siting of sheriff facilities within their jurisdiction. Since time delays can create problems in siting County facilities in the most appropriate locations for serving the area's rapidly expanding population, a mechanism which includes all affected jurisdictions and assures their participation is needed to jointly plan the siting of these facilities.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

A SAFE LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR SAN DIEGO COUNTY RESIDENTS.

GOAL

FACILITIES TO SUPPORT A SERVICE LEVEL OF FOUR PATROL SHIFTS PER DAY PER 10,000 POPULATION, OR SERVICE AREA EQUIVALENT FOR COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL LAND USES.

OBJECTIVE 1:

A level of facilities sufficient to accommodate a service level of three patrol shifts per day per 10,000 population, or service-area-equivalent for commercial/industrial land uses, as an interim step toward meeting the facility goal.

OBJECTIVE 2:

Coordination of the land use decisionmaking process with the availability of adequate law enforcement facilities.

Policy 2.1: The County will consider the availability of Sheriff facilities/services in the planning process.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Refer discretionary projects to the Sheriff's Department for review and recommendations on appropriate conditions on development approval to ensure adequate sheriff facilities and response time capabilities to the project. [DPLU, SHE]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Coordinate with the Sheriff's Department during the comprehensive update of Community Plans, including the review of proposed land use and zoning changes, to ensure that proposed land uses can be adequately served. [DPLU, SHE]

Implementation Measure 2.1.3: Study the relationship between land use patterns and law enforcement needs, and consider that relationship in reviewing all discretionary applications. [SHE, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Equitable sharing of funding for sheriff facilities by the County, all contract cities, and by all new development that will benefit from the facilities.

Policy 3.1: The County will expand facilities serving the existing population to a level consistent with the short term objective identified in Objective 1.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Research and develop measures of facility adequacy for unincorporated areas that take into account population served, population distribution, and other factors affecting the ability to provide law enforcement service in these areas. [SHE, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Identify sources of funds from the existing population in order to remedy existing deficiencies to meet the short term objective identified in Objective 1, or the level of facility adequacy developed under Implementation Measure 3.1.1. [SHE]

Policy 3.2: New development in the unincorporated area will be required to contribute its fair share toward financing sheriff facilities toward achieving the short term objective.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Develop and utilize a development impact fee program which requires new development to contribute its fair share of facility costs toward achieving the short-term objective for the unincorporated area. [DPLU, SHE]

Policy 3.3: Contract cities shall be expected to provide equitable funding for new facilities and facilities expansion to serve new development, through a means mutually agreeable to the City and County.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1: Include, as part of contract negotiations with cities, a means for city fair-share contribution for facility expansion to serve new development within the city. Such means could be an impact fee paid by new development, additional direct payments by cities for contract services, city construction of facilities, or other comparable means established through the contract negotiation process. [SHE]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Timely siting of Sheriff's facilities in the most appropriate location in order to serve the population, regardless of jurisdictional boundaries.

Policy 4.1: The County will coordinate with contract cities to cooperatively develop plans for the siting of Sheriff's facilities that will best serve the needs of the population served.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Seek the support of contract cities in selecting suitable sites for Sheriff's facilities. [SHE]

Policy 4.2: Sheriff facilities shall be designed and located based on appropriate criteria.

Implementation Measure 4.2.1: Consider the following factors in the siting of sheriff facilities:

- a) access,
 - b) visibility,
 - c) potential for co-location with complementary uses (e.g., fire station),
 - d) sufficient site size to accommodate the level of facility needed for build-out, and
 - e) proximity to the population served.
- [SHE, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 5:

Subdivision design which promotes a safe living and working environment.

Policy 5.1: The County will require, whenever possible, subdivision design that aids in crime prevention and law enforcement operations.

Implementation Measure 5.1.1: Refer land use development proposals to the Sheriff's Department for its review and recommendations on design criteria, suitability of existing facilities to serve the proposed development and other law enforcement concerns specific to the project. [SHE, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 5.1.2: Seek opportunities to improve the design of the physical environment to minimize crime opportunities and maximize alternative activities. Such opportunities may include redevelopment programs, review of community plan updates to ensure balanced land uses, or the provision of adequate social, recreational and employment opportunities for youth. [SHE, DPLU]

SECTION 8. ANIMAL CONTROL

OVERVIEW

State law mandates that jurisdictions provide specific regulatory and medical services designed to ensure the protection and health of animals and people. This is accomplished through the following types of programs: 1) emergency care for injured animals; 2) surveillance for rabies and quarantine of biting animals; 3) investigation and prosecution of violations of anti-cruelty laws; 4) control of vicious or stray animals; 5) licensing of dogs; 6) adoption services; 7) spay/neuter referral and information programs; 8) public education and information programs; 9) inspection and licensing of private kennels; and 10) humane disposal of old, injured and unwanted animals.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The San Diego County Department of Animal Control provides animal control services in the unincorporated area, and by contract to the cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Lemon Grove, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach and Vista. The Department's service area covers 4,126 square miles, or approximately 96% of San Diego County. Within this service area there are approximately 486,000 cats and 441,000 dogs.¹

The majority of the Department's animal control services are aimed at responding to cat and dog health and safety problems in its service area. The Department operates three shelters (Central, North and South County), shown on Figure 8-A. Each shelter provides temporary holding kennels for impounded, stray, quarantined, injured or owner-relinquished animals. All three shelters provide spay/neuter referral programs and the Central and South shelters perform spaying and neutering in their animal medical care facilities. Field officers investigate citizen complaints regarding animals, issue citations for violations of state and county animal control codes and impound animals. In 1989-90, the three shelters impounded a combined total of 41,050 animals, the majority being dogs and cats. On average, there were 650 to 700 animals per day in the shelters.

The South Shelter, constructed in Bonita in 1976, is the newest and the busiest of the three. In 1989-90, this shelter impounded 16,581 animals, with an average daily population of approximately 250 animals. Facilities located at this shelter include: 128 dog kennels, 2 cat holding rooms, a livestock corral area, an animal medical care office and a customer service/office area.

¹ These figures were derived from national averages.

FIGURE 8-A GOES HERE

The Central Shelter, built in 1932, is located in the Morena area of San Diego. It is owned by the City of San Diego, but is operated and maintained by the County Department of Animal Control. This shelter impounded 14,106 animals in 1989-90, and had an average daily population of approximately 220 animals. Facilities located at this shelter include: 100 dog kennels, 5 cat holding rooms, an animal medical care office, and a customer service/office area.

The North Shelter, located in Carlsbad, was constructed in the 1960's and is the smallest of the three shelters. In 1989-90, the Shelter impounded 10,363 animals and had an average daily population of approximately 200 animals. Facilities located at this shelter include 84 dog kennels, 40 cat kennels, a livestock corral area, a small animal treatment facility and a customer service/office area.

The Department's administrative and licensing offices occupy 6,200 square feet of mobile trailer office space adjacent to the Central Shelter. Another 2,000 square feet of this trailer space is for Central Shelter support personnel, dispatch operations and a Vicious Dog Task Force staff/hearing room.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVEL

Currently animal control facilities are operating above their designed capacity. The Central and North shelters were constructed at a time when the average combined daily animal population in the shelters was between 300 and 400 animals. In 1989-90, the three shelters' average combined daily population was between 650 and 700 animals - twice their designed capacity. The North and Central shelters provide facilities at a service level of approximately 0.05 square feet of shelter space per human dwelling unit. The South shelter, the County's newest shelter, provides facilities at slightly less than 0.13 square feet of shelter space per dwelling unit served. This shelter meets the Humane Society standards but falls short of the County Administrative Manual space requirements.

In 1990, the Department's administrative capital facilities were being used to their maximum capacity. Continued increases in the Department's service level will result in the need to expand the administrative facilities.

In 1990, the medical capital facilities were below standards recommended by the Humane Society. With only 2,700 square feet of medical facilities, the Department is far short of the 5,500 square feet that would be needed to meet Humane Society standards. The problem is most noticeable at the North shelter, where the medical facilities are so small that surgeries cannot be performed at the shelter.

FUNDING METHODS

Several funding sources are utilized to cover facility costs. The County pays for its share of facility costs with both General Fund monies and service revenues. The contract cities pay their share of capital facilities through A-87 Indirect Costs billed through the city contracts. However, initial funding for capital facilities comes from the County General Fund since there is a two year delay between the time the County expends funds and the time the cities are billed for their share of these costs.

Another potential source of funding for animal control facilities has been through donations and special events. However, these sources have been inconsistent and typically generate only small amounts of money. The Department of Animal Control does not actively solicit donations except for two programs: Pitchers for Pets and Walk With the Animals.

ISSUES

1. The Department of Animal Control's shelters are operating at levels above their constructed/designed capacity.

Discussion: All three animal control shelters are routinely housing more animals than they were designed/constructed to hold. The North and Central shelters routinely house nearly double their designed/constructed capacity. Operating at this density poses a greater risk of injury to animals and disease in the kennels, and also places the officers in greater danger when handling the animals.

In 1990, based on an average of all three shelters, the Department's facility level was .07 square feet of shelter space per dwelling unit served. This level is far below the 0.13 square feet of shelter space per dwelling unit needed to meet the County Administrative Manual space requirements, and U. S. Humane Society and American Humane Society standards for animal control shelters².

2. Current shelters do not adequately provide a healthy and safe environment for staff or the animals under the Department's care.

Discussion: Due to age, interruptions in scheduled maintenance, and normal wear, the three shelters are in various states of disrepair. The condition of the physical plants at the Central and North Shelters has deteriorated to the point that they need to be completely replaced. The South Shelter, being newer, needs only

² The County Administrative Manual outlines employee space requirements and the U.S. Humane Society and American Humane Society provide standards on the amount of kennel space required per animal. The standard of 0.13 sq. ft. was derived by converting these space standards and requirements to the amount of space required per human dwelling unit. This standard excludes parking lots.

major maintenance to be refurbished and brought up to satisfactory condition.

3. New development creates a need for additional animal control facilities.

Discussion: When new development occurs, the number of animals impounded increases and additional staff is necessary to provide services. Increased impounds and staffing will require additional facilities to prevent exacerbating already overcrowded conditions. Therefore to keep pace with the region's anticipated growth and to meet the Department of Animal Control's objective of 0.13 square feet of shelter space per dwelling unit, the County will need to: (1) construct a new regional facility in Poway; (2) double the size of the South County shelter; and (3) build satellite shelters in San Marcos, Encinitas and Santee. The locations of the proposed shelters are shown on Figure 8-A.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

AN EFFECTIVE ANIMAL CONTROL PROGRAM THAT PROVIDES FOR THE CARE AND PROTECTION OF THE DOMESTIC ANIMAL POPULATION, SAFETY OF PEOPLE FROM DOMESTIC ANIMALS, AND THE EDUCATION OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Facilities sufficient to provide .13 square feet of shelter space per dwelling unit.

OBJECTIVE 2:

Improvement of existing animal control facilities.

Policy 2.1: The County will expand existing animal control facilities to meet the objective.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Identify additional funding mechanisms to contribute toward upgrading and maintaining existing facilities to meet the objective. [DAC]

Policy 2.2: The County will provide a safe and healthful environment for

impounded animals.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Provide adequate maintenance of all animal control shelters. [DAC]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Timely siting of animal control facilities in the most appropriate locations in order to accommodate the needs of the population served, regardless of jurisdictional boundaries.

Policy 3.1: The County will coordinate with contract cities to cooperatively develop plans for locating animal control facilities that will best serve the needs of the area served.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Seek the support of contract cities in selecting suitable sites for animal control facilities. [DAC]

Policy 3.2: Animal control facilities will be sited in the most suitable locations based on specific criteria.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Consider the following criteria when siting new animal control facilities:

- a) Close proximity to densely populated areas;
 - b) Close proximity to a major transportation route; and
 - c) Ability to utilize natural topography as a means of soundproofing.
- [DAC, DGS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Equitable sharing of the funding of animal control facilities by the County, all contract cities, and by all new development that will benefit from the facilities.

Policy 4.1: New development shall be required to contribute its fair share toward financing animal control facilities to achieve the short term objective.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Develop and utilize an impact fee program that requires new development to contribute its fair share of facility costs toward achieving the short term objective. [DAC, DPLU]

Policy 4.2: Cities shall be expected to provide equitable funding for new facilities and facilities expansion, through a means mutually agreeable to the city and County.

Implementation Measure 4.2.1: Include, as part of contract negotiations with cities, a means for city fair-share contribution for facility expansion to serve new development. Such means could be an impact fee paid by new development, additional direct payment by cities for contract services, or other comparable means established through the contract negotiation process. [DAC]

SECTION 9. LIBRARIES

OVERVIEW

Libraries play a key role in educating and distributing information to the general public, and provide a focal point for community awareness for many. State of California Education Code Sections 19100 and 18701 address the provision of county library service. Section 18701 declares that all people should have access to public libraries, and Section 19100 enables counties to establish and maintain libraries. San Diego County libraries provide reference and reader's advisory services consisting of books, magazines, newspapers, government documents, large print books, art prints, audio and video cassettes and 16mm films.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The San Diego County Library was established in 1912 by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. For taxing purposes, the County Library is a library district, and has its own property tax share. The County Library serves approximately 843,000 residents and covers over 3,818 square miles, including the unincorporated area and 11 incorporated cities. The cities served include: Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach and Vista. In 1990, there were approximately 300,000 library card holders in the County Library's service area.

In 1990, the County Library operated 31 branch libraries, a Governmental Reference Library located in the City of San Diego, 2 bookmobiles and a Library Administrative Headquarters. The Library System is divided into three regions: North, South, and East. Each region is served by a "Regional Center," which is a branch library that oversees regional children's and reference services.

Of the 31 branch libraries, a total of 13 branch libraries are operated within 11 incorporated cities. The remaining branch libraries are in unincorporated communities. The County Library owns 11 of these 33 facilities, including the Administrative Headquarters; 19 are leased; and 3 are owned by the County, including the Governmental Reference Library. The County Library also owns 2 bookmobiles serving residents living in outlying areas. The locations of 1990 existing and planned County library facilities are shown in Figure 9-A.

FIGURE 9-A GOES HERE

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

In 1990, the County Library used 111,579 square feet of facility floor area not including the Government Reference Library, which serves the entire San Diego region. This translated to an average of 0.13 square feet of branch library floor space per capita for the total population served. Table 9-1 shows the 1989 facility levels for the populations served by each branch library.

The following additional facilities are planned:

Community	Facility	Planned Completion	Net Gain In Sq.Ft.
El Cajon	Replacement	1991	21,900
San Marcos	Replacement	1992	9,300
Ramona	Replacement	1990	800
Rancho San Diego	Addition New	1992, dependent upon the timing of development	26,500
Total			58,500

In 1990, a temporary branch served the City of El Cajon. This temporary branch will be replaced by a larger permanent branch, which will be completed by 1991. A new facility, scheduled for completion in 1992, will be built in San Marcos to replace the existing branch, and a community meeting room is planned for addition to the Ramona branch library in 1990. A new branch is planned to serve the Rancho San Diego development and surrounding areas. The completion date of this branch is dependent on the timing and number of development permits processed in the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan Area. This branch is anticipated to open in 1992.

The addition of this large amount of square footage will significantly improve current floor space deficiencies. However, this improvement will be somewhat offset by a substantial growth in population served by the County Library that will occur before these facilities open.

In 1990, the County Library had a collection of over one million items including 700,000 books. This equates to approximately one item or book per capita. In addition, the County Library, independent city libraries, and the Imperial County Library cooperate to form the Serra Library System. This system enables San Diego County library card holders to check out library books from the 12 other Serra member libraries, and vice versa. The County and the City of San Diego share a joint automated circulation

system, and the County Library's acquisition, cataloging and interlibrary loan services are also automated.

TABLE 9-1
1989 COUNTY LIBRARY FACILITY DEFICIENCIES
BASED ON OBJECTIVE FACILITY LEVELS

BRANCH	POPULATION SERVED	EXISTING SQ. FT.	SQ. FT./ CAPITA	SQ. FT. ¹ (DEFICIENCY)/SUR PLUS	CURRENT VOLUMES	VOLUMES/ CAPITA	VOLUMES ¹ (DEFICIENCY)/S URPLUS
Alpine	8,297	3,500	0.42	596	15,194	1.80	(1,400)
Bonita	8,438	3,000	0.16	(3,453)	18,073	1.00	(18,803)
Borrego	2,740	960	0.35	0	6,198	2.26	718
Campo	2,536	470	0.18	(418)	3,598	1.40	(1,474)
Cardiff-by-the-	14,203	1,540	0.10	(3,431)	10,418	0.73	(17,998)
Sea	35,093	2,628	0.07	(9,655)	24,779	0.70	(45,407)
Casa De Oro	5,950	1,343	0.23	(740)	6,315	1.06	(5,585)
Crest	5,120	2,268	0.44	(476)	18,551	3.60	8,311
Del Mar	2,331	192	0.08	(624)	3,137	1.30	(1,525)
Descanso	89,850	8,100	0.09	(23,348)	74,444	0.83	(105,259)
El Cajon	51,631	4,100	0.08	(13,971)	36,880	0.70	(66,382)
Encinitas	32,041	8,100	0.25	(3,114)	34,334	1.07	(29,748)
Fallbrook	16,120	2,366	0.15	(3,276)	20,332	1.26	(11,908)
Fletcher Hills	25,612	5,000	0.20	(3,964)	29,329	1.15	(21,895)
Imperial Beach	1,007	500	0.50	148	3,850	3.80	1,836
Jacumba	2,488	1,900	0.77	1,043	7,939	3.20	3,043
Julian	52,334	8,600	0.16	(9,717)	74,581	1.40	(30,087)
La Mesa	47,019	3,200	0.07	(13,257)	24,739	0.50	(69,299)
Lakeside	22,623	9,000	0.40	1,082	44,807	2.00	(439)
Lemon Grove	1,819	400	0.22	(237)	5,752	3.15	2,114
Lincoln Acres	2,448	909	0.36	38	4,243	1.70	(733)
Pine Valley	483	912	1.90	743	4,050	8.40	3,084
Potrero	41,307	5,000	0.12	(9,457)	40,392	1.00	(42,222)
Poway	24,418	3,900	0.16	(4,646)	17,950	0.70	(30,886)
Ramona	7,951	7,100	0.89	4,317	16,570	2.00	668
Rancho Santa Fe	30,260	4,752	0.21	(5,839)	20,136	0.67	(40,384)
San Marcos	51,874	6,470	0.12	(11,686)	33,071	0.64	(70,677)
Santee	14,480	3,835	0.26	(1,233)	27,023	1.90	(1,937)
Solana Beach	26,921	4,354	0.16	(5,068)	21,200	0.79	(32,642)
Spring Valley	12,270	2,780	0.23	(1,515)	17,125	1.40	(7,415)
Valley Center	56,402	4,400	0.07	(15,341)	45,401	0.80	(67,403)

Vista							
TOTAL	843,648²	111,579³	0.13	(183,698)	710,411	0.84	(976,885)

¹ Based on goals of 0.35 square feet of branch library floor space and 2 volumes per County Library District resident.

² Total population figure includes 137,582 residents not served by a specific branch library.

³ Total square footage figure does not include the Government Reference Library, which serves the entire County.

FUNDING METHODS

Funding for construction of new County library facilities comes from external non-operating sources, including redevelopment tax increment financing within cities, contributions from the cities and communities served, private contributions, and federal Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title II grants. Since the County Library has its own property tax share (approximately 1.5% of the 1% property tax), funding library facilities is not the responsibility of the County General Fund. However, the Library system is experiencing critical funding problems resulting from Proposition 13 and changes to Special District Augmentation Fund distribution. This funding shortage, and the County Library's inability to fund operations and maintenance costs, have greatly constrained efforts to expand County library facilities.

PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS

Private contributions and fund raising provide an important source of revenue for the County Library. These funds include donations from individuals, groups, grant-making agencies, and corporations. Although these contributions are generally solicited, many are not. In addition, some contributors make conditioned donations requiring the County Library to match funds, or spend the money in a specific way or in a specific area. Private contributions may play an increasingly important role in providing library facilities; however, this funding source cannot be relied upon for ongoing expenditures.

GRANTS

Funding from the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title II is administered by the State as competitive grants to local jurisdictions for the construction or renovation of public libraries. The County Library has received some Library Services and Construction Act grant funding for the construction of the new El Cajon Branch Library, as has the City of San Marcos.

SPECIAL TAX

Government Code Section 53717 et seq. authorizes local jurisdictions to impose special taxes for the purposes of providing public library facilities and services. Such taxes cannot be assessed on an ad valorem basis, but may be based on benefit received by parcels of real property. These special taxes require a two-thirds vote of those affected, but do not require resolutions by each city in the district.

USER FEES

User fees are charges assessed on users of a facility or service for the privilege of using the facility or service. Such fees could be assessed on library users to provide a new source of revenue, which could be used for facilities expansion. However, the legality of

user fees for libraries is questionable. A 1978 State Attorney General's opinion maintained that use of public libraries must remain free. In addition, user fees would restrict access for many, and would be contrary to the mission of public libraries to provide library service to everyone. User fees may also reduce the County Library's financial and political support.

ISSUES:

1. In 1990, the County Library was experiencing facility deficiencies and critical funding shortages.

Discussion: To meet the County Library's minimum acceptable facility goals of 0.35 square feet of floor area and 2.0 books per capita would require the addition of over 180,000 square feet, and over 975,000 volumes. In 1989, over two-thirds of the library facilities were below goal levels in floor area and volumes for their population served. Existing deficiencies for each branch library, based on the goal facility levels of 0.35 square feet and 2.0 volumes per capita, are shown in Table 10-1.

Due to critical funding shortages, the County Library is not able to fund the development and operation of new branch libraries. In order to meet goal facility levels, the County Library, and cities and unincorporated communities within the County Library's service area, must seek new sources of funding for the development and operation of new branch libraries.

The Long Range Library Financing Task Force met during 1988 to address the County Library's funding crisis. The Task Force's report, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors, included a recommendation for the placement of a special tax measure on the ballot.

2. Population growth within the service area of the County Library is a factor contributing to the need for expansion of County library facilities.

Discussion: New development located within the service area of the County Library, including the eleven cities, increases the population served and the need to expand library facilities. The County Library does not generate sufficient revenue to build or expand library facilities, and unless facilities are expanded to meet the needs of the new development, existing library deficiencies will be exacerbated.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

SUFFICIENT LIBRARIES TO MEET THE INFORMATION AND EDUCATION NEEDS OF THE POPULATION SERVED BY THE COUNTY LIBRARY.

GOAL

CONTINUED FREE ACCESS TO ALL COUNTY LIBRARY FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Achieve, through consistent and incremental improvement, the facility levels of 0.35 square feet of branch library floor space and 2.0 books, or the equivalent in automated information sources, per resident served by the County Library.

Policy 1.1: The County will seek external funding sources for the expansion of library facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Monitor innovative financing techniques, and consider those that may be feasible for the provision of library facilities. [LIB]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Encourage private contributions for the provision of library facilities. [LIB]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Seek Library Services and Construction Act Title II grants. [LIB]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Promote appropriate state and federal legislation that would increase funding for the provision of library facilities. [OIA, LIB]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Do not develop new branch libraries without sufficient funding for operations and maintenance. [LIB]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Equitable sharing of funding for library facilities by unincorporated communities and all cities in the County Library's service area, and by all new development that will benefit from the facilities.

Policy 2.1: Cities and unincorporated communities will be expected to provide funding for new facilities and facilities expansion, through a means mutually agreeable to the cities/communities and the County Library.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Request unincorporated communities and cities within the County Library's service area to assume responsibility for the costs of new facilities and facility expansions necessary to serve the population. [LIB]

Policy 2.2: The County will attempt to establish funding programs in conjunction with cities within the County Library's service area to ensure that new development in these cities and the unincorporated area contributes its fair share to provide library facilities to serve new development.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Examine the feasibility of a development impact fee in the unincorporated area to finance library facilities to serve new development. [LIB, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Seek action by affected cities to ensure that new development in cities served by County libraries contributes its fair and full share of the costs of these facilities. [LIB, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Timely siting of all libraries in the most appropriate locations to serve residents of the County Library District irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries.

Policy 3.1: The County will coordinate with affected cities and communities to assess needs, and cooperatively generate plans for siting and developing libraries that best serve the needs of the residents of the County Library's service area.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Work with affected cities within the County Library's service area to assess library facility needs, and plan and site libraries that will serve these cities. [LIB]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Use the Community and Subregional Plan Update process to study the library facility needs of the plan areas, and

incorporate findings and recommendations into County library facility planning. [DPLU, LIB]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Include the following factors in the determination of the best sites for branch libraries:

- a) Access to the intended service population;
 - b) Availability of the property;
 - c) Existing library deficiency in intended service area;
 - d) Suitability of site to meet identified needs; and
 - e) Location of the site relative to complementary facilities, such as schools, parks, and civic centers.
- [LIB, DPLU]

Policy 3.2: The County will promote the joint planning, development and operation of County libraries and complementary facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Work with the Department of Parks and Recreation, cities, school districts and other appropriate agencies to plan and site complementary facilities. [LIB, DPR, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: When feasible, participate in joint powers agreements with the Department of Parks and Recreation, school districts and other appropriate agencies for the development and operation of their respective facilities. [LIB, DPR]

SECTION 10. SCHOOLS

OVERVIEW

The education of young people is essential to ensure that our society continues to thrive. The importance of public education has long been recognized: education was one of the earliest public services to be offered by a governmental body. The first school district in San Diego County was created in 1872, only about 20 years after the County itself was legally established. School districts offer education to all school-age residents of the San Diego region. In addition, schools often serve as a community hub, or focal point.

Created by the State (as authorized by Article IX, Section 14 of the Constitution of the State of California), school districts are subject to the overview of the State Legislature and are entirely independent of the County Board of Supervisors. Budgeting and decisionmaking are done by elected governing boards. Site and construction standards are established by the State Department of Education (Section 39000 of the Government Code). The State Architect in the State Department of General Services must approve plans and specifications for educational facilities (Section 39113 of the Education Code).

The County's responsibilities for the review of educational facilities is limited to site review of proposed school sites by the Planning Commission in the interests of public safety and for a determination of compliance with the Public Facility Element, the Land Use Element and other portions of the County General Plan. The effect of this requirement is limited: if the Planning Commission's recommendation is unfavorable, the school district need only wait 30 days before acquiring the property.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The unincorporated area of the County is served by 36 school districts, including unified, elementary and high school districts. Unified school districts offer classes from kindergarten to twelfth grade (abbreviated as K-12). Boundaries of the school districts that serve the San Diego region are illustrated in Figure 10-A and Figure 10-B.

As Table 11-1 indicates, the schools serving the unincorporated area of San Diego County are under the jurisdiction of 23 elementary school districts, 6 high school districts and 7 unified school districts. Another four elementary school districts and three unified school districts (including the San Diego Unified School District which administers almost half the schools of the region) serve only incorporated territory.

FIGURE 11-A GOES HERE

FIGURE 11-B GOES HERE

TABLE 10-1
SCHOOL DISTRICTS SERVING THE SAN DIEGO REGION IN 1990

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS	UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Alpine Union	Borrego Springs Unified
Bonsall Union	Carlsbad Unified*
Cajon Valley Union	Coronado Unified*
Cardiff*	Mountain Empire Unified
Chula Vista Elementary	Oceanside Unified
Dehesa	Poway Unified
Del Mar Union*	Ramona Unified
Encinitas Union	San Diego Unified*
Escondido Union	San Marcos Unified
Fallbrook Union Elementary	Vista Unified
Jamul-Dulzura Union	
Julian Union	
Lakeside Union	
La Mesa-Spring Valley	
Lemon Grove*	
National	
Pauma	
Rancho Santa Fe	
San Pasqual	
San Ysidro	
Santee	
Solana Beach	
South Bay Union*	
Spencer Valley	
Vallecitos	
Valley Center Union	
Warner Union	
	HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS
	Escondido Union High
	Fallbrook Union High
	Grossmont Union High
	Julian Union High
	San Dieguito Union High
	Sweetwater Union High

*These school districts do not serve students residing in unincorporated areas.

Students living in the unincorporated parts of the County attend 225 elementary schools; 47 junior high, middle and intermediate schools; 1 junior/senior high school; 36 senior high schools; and 19 atypical, court and camp schools. (Note that unless otherwise indicated, data in this chapter only covers the facilities of school districts whose service area includes unincorporated territory.)

The County Office of Education, which despite its name is entirely independent of the County government, is a publicly supported local agency with a mandate to operate certain educational programs and provide services to the 43 school districts in the County.

The County is also divided into five community college districts which are not discussed in this Element.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

In 1990, conditions of overcrowding occurred at about three-quarters of all schools located in the County. For example, one elementary school, serving children residing in the unincorporated part of the County, had been built to house 525 students but enrollment was more than double that (1,117 students). It appears that high schools serving only unincorporated areas are not as overcrowded yet (e.g., enrollment of 1,989 in a school with capacity for 1,564), but as elementary school children get older, the situation will worsen. Year-round schools, double sessions and the use of temporary classrooms are being used in order to provide a desk for every child.

FUNDING METHODS

The primary source of funding for the construction of educational facilities is the State of California. Using monies from bonds and the General Fund, the State government allocates money based on relative need to school districts throughout California, to reconstruct, remodel or replace existing school buildings and to acquire new school sites and buildings. The State Allocation Board considers applications from school districts and makes apportionments of its limited funds based on the number of unhoused students in a school district.

By the late 1980's there were insufficient state funds to pay for even half the annual costs of school facilities. A school district pays for its part of the cost of the facility in one of two ways:

- o In exchange for funding, the school district transfers to the State an amount equivalent to the monies collectable under school impact fees during the time period beginning with approval of the construction project and ending at the notice of completion; or
- o The District can agree to pay for one-half of costs, in which case, it is given higher priority for state funds.

The money that school districts collect from their share of the property tax and from State support based on average daily attendance figures is used primarily for salaries, maintenance, and other operating expenses.

Consequently, very little of it remains to fund facility construction. The funds that districts receive from the state lottery cannot be used for capital expenditures; moreover, they contribute only a very small percentage of school districts' operating budgets.

The State has determined permissible local funding methods. These include, but are not limited to:

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Under Section 53080 of the Government Code, school districts collect fees from new development before the County can issue a building permit. The amount charged varies by type of building and is based on square footage. In 1990 the maximum that elementary and high school districts serving an area could jointly collect was set at \$1.58 per square foot of residential area and \$0.26 per square foot for commercial and industrial space. These maximum values are adjusted biennially to take into account the increase in construction costs.

FEES FOR TEMPORARY FACILITIES

Government Code Section 65970 et seq. (often referred to as SB201) permits school districts to collect fees for supplementary classroom facilities if present facilities are overcrowded. Since the maximum amount that can be collected at building permit stage is set at the same ceiling as that under Section 53080, there is little incentive to make use of the SB201 funding mechanism. No additional benefits are gained.

LAND DEDICATION/EXACTIONS

Under Government Code 65970, school districts can require the dedication of land instead of fees for projects with more than 50 units. Agreements may take the form of land dedication and/or payment of fees for part of the costs of construction of the school facilities necessary to meet the need created by the development.

MELLO-ROOS COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICT

Section 53311 et seq. of the Government Code permits school districts to assess a special tax to finance facilities in all or part of their territory if two-thirds of the affected residents (if there are more than 12 registered voters residing in the area), or two-thirds of the property owners (in other cases) agree.

OTHER SOURCES

Other sources of funding for school facilities include: lease-revenue bonds, general obligation bonds, certificates of participation and tax increments from redevelopment agencies.

ISSUES

1. School districts are having difficulty contending with rapid growth in enrollment.

Discussion: The population of California has been increasing for a number of years. A disproportionate share of that growth has been in the San Diego region: while the population of the state has grown by about 2.75% each year from 1960 to 1985, San Diego population has increased by more than 4% annually during those years.

The trend is continuing. Enrollment in the San Diego region (K-12) is projected to increase from an estimated 382,000 in 1989 to 515,000 by 2000. Between 1977 and 1988, the school districts had difficulty providing facilities for the total growth in student population of 14%. The 41% increase projected for the period between 1989 and 2000 will be even harder to cope with. School districts in the northern section of the unincorporated area of the County will be particularly impacted since enrollment is projected to increase by 33,586 (a 67% increase).

2. State legislation places limits on some sources of funding.

Discussion: California school enrollment has increased by more than 100,000 students each year during the last two decades. While the State has established a program to pay for the construction of schools, this program is underfunded and does not meet the goal of provision of schools concurrent with need. In addition, between 1985 and 1988, the cost to provide school facilities to meet California's needs more than doubled.

Subsequent to the passage of Proposition 13, legislation allowed school districts to assess development for a sizable portion of the cost of providing educational facilities needed to accommodate the students associated with that development. County policy at one time encouraged school districts to do this, however, State legislation later pre-empted the field of development impact fees. Government Code Section 53080 sets a ceiling on the amount that new development can be assessed. This amount is insufficient to meet the school facility needs of most new development. The acquisition of school sites is especially problematic given the escalating value of land in San Diego County.

Since 1987, the State Legislature has declared that the exclusive means by which cities and counties can address the overcrowding of schools is by requiring school impact fees at the time a building permit is requested. (Government Code Sections 65995) This legislation significantly restructured the role of the County in evaluating the impacts of subdivision projects on the need for school construction.

The intent of this legislation was to create a partnership for the financing of school facilities between the State and local school districts. Because of this collaboration, the fee assessed at the building permit stage was not intended to provide for full financing. However, due to shortfalls in State funds, many school districts must rely solely on these fees to fund new construction; the revenues generated are often insufficient.

In general, the ability of the County to require a developer to fund the construction of schools needed by the new residents is limited to an amount that typically provides for less than half the actual costs of providing the facility.

However, a 1988 court case¹ has indicated that additional requirements for mitigation of impacts on school facilities can be imposed on projects requiring general plan amendments, rezones and other projects requiring legislative decisions.

3. The use of relocatable classrooms has an effect on the functioning of school campuses.

Discussion: Rapidly increasing student enrollment has forced many school districts in San Diego County to add relocatable classrooms to existing campuses. The placement of relocatable classrooms can create a variety of difficulties, including:

- o Classroom configuration: Most relocatables are 24 ft. x 40 ft. Standard classrooms are usually 32 ft. x 30 ft. Relocatables give teachers less flexibility in instructional arrangements;
- o Outdoor space: The State Department of Education recognizes a ratio of 2:1 for land and buildings on school sites. This ratio provides adequate room for playgrounds. As relocatables are placed on the site more students are added and less land is available for playground purposes;
- o Support facilities: Additional students and buildings result in more staff, parents, aides, and visitors to the site. The core facilities of the school are rarely expanded to handle this increase. Therefore, parking lots, restrooms, teacher work space and lounges, special education and counseling areas, and meeting rooms become overburdened. As school size grows, it becomes difficult to find a place to assemble the full population for schoolwide meetings.

¹Mira Development Corporation v. City of San Diego, (1988) Cal. App. 3d 1201 (252 Cal. Rptr. 825)

4. The use of school playing fields for parks requires continued joint planning and scheduling.

Discussion: The State encourages the joint use of facilities for parks and schools. There is a need to enhance coordination and to encourage the joint provision of such facilities in appropriate cases. Consideration must be given to scheduling and other requirements of the school district and the park provider and operator.

5. Special types of educational facilities and equipment are necessary to meet the technological needs of the 21st century.

Discussion: As technology becomes more complex, and a more critical part of education, the need for specialized facilities increases. It is important to set aside space for laboratories and other special education centers in which the wiring and utilities needed for computers and other equipment are installed. In addition, the equipment itself is a significant portion of the cost of providing up-to-date educational facilities. State financing calculations do not sufficiently take this into account.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

HIGH QUALITY, K-12 EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Provision of educational facilities sufficient to meet the demands of new development concurrent with need.

Policy 1.1: The County will seek the modification of state laws and regulations to improve the funding of new school sites and facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Coordinate with school districts to seek the amendment of state laws and regulations in order to ensure the timely availability of school facilities. [OIA, DPLU]

Policy 1.2: To the extent allowable under State law, new development shall be required to provide additional facilities needed to serve children generated by the new development. Such facilities shall be of the quality and quantity sufficient to meet State Department of Education standards or to maintain an existing higher level of service provided by an affected school districts' facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Notify school districts of proposed subdivision projects early in the review process. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Request that school districts indicate the level of facilities available to serve development projects requiring discretionary review. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.3: To the extent allowable under State law, condition the approval of general plan amendments, community plan updates, specific plans, specific plan amendments, rezones and other legislative land development decisions on the availability of school facilities at time of need. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.4: Coordinate with developers and the school districts to ensure that adequately located and sized school sites are provided to meet increases in need. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.5: Work with the cities and school districts to ensure that new development contributes, to the extent allowable under State law, its fair and full share of the costs of expanding or providing school facilities irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.6: Work with the affected school districts in the evaluation of the suitability of both designated and dedicated school sites, using State Department of Education standards or those in effect in the school districts. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Elimination of substandard facilities currently in use.

Policy 2.1: The County will support school districts' efforts to obtain financing for the improvement of existing facilities.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Assist school districts in their attempts to find new sources of funding for the rehabilitation and improvement of inadequate existing facilities. [DPLU, OIA]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Encourage legislation that would change the voter approval requirement for general obligation bonds dealing with education from the present two-thirds to a simple majority. [OIA]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Location of schools to best serve users while minimizing negative impacts.

Policy 3.1: Land use planning will be coordinated with the planning of school facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Use community plan updates and general plan amendments to identify the general location of proposed schools and other complementary facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measures 3.1.2: Encourage the various local agencies, school districts and jurisdictions of the region to coordinate standards, policies and criteria for the funding and siting of school facilities. [DPLU, OIA]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Evaluate proposed school sites based on State, County, district and pertinent local standards. The following factors are to be analyzed:

- a) Availability;
 - b) Situation and access;
 - c) Geological and seismological conditions;
 - d) Physical and engineering constraints; and
 - e) Community impacts.
- [DPLU]

Policy 3.2: The County will support the joint and timely planning of the location and use of schools with the planning of related public facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Coordinate the planning and siting of schools, recreational facilities, child care centers, libraries and other related public facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Work with the facility providers to ensure that, where feasible, school facilities are sited in the location most suitable to serve the present and projected future residents of the region. [DPLU]

SECTION 11. FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

OVERVIEW

Fire protection and emergency services are among the most vital and basic community needs. Generally, firefighters are the first responders to fires, medical emergencies, hazardous materials incidents, floods, earthquakes and other emergencies and disasters. In addition, firefighters perform fire prevention and public education activities.

Of the total service calls responded to by fire protection agencies in the unincorporated area, typically about 60% are for emergency medical services. Fire suppression, false alarms, automatic/mutual aid responses, and fire prevention each usually accounts for about 10% of these calls. Hazardous material accidents account for less than 0.5% of the emergency service responses, although the number of these responses has increased rapidly in recent years.

Firefighters must be prepared to respond quickly and effectively to all types of emergencies. For this reason, the provision of adequate facilities for fire protection and emergency services is fundamental to protecting the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of San Diego County.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The multiple agencies providing fire protection in San Diego County can be classified by their primary fire protection responsibilities. Although state and federal agencies and fire protection districts have specific responsibilities for wildland or structural fires, all agencies will, to the extent their resources permit, respond to many types of emergency calls in their respective areas regardless of responsibility. Due to mutual aid and automatic aid response agreements, these agencies frequently work together in fire suppression and emergency service responses. Table 11-1 lists the dependent and independent districts providing structural fire protection in the unincorporated area, and the state and federal wildland fire protection agencies.

STRUCTURAL FIRE PROTECTION

In the unincorporated area of the County, structural fire protection and emergency services are provided by 21 independent special districts, 7 dependent County Service Areas (CSAs), 2 subsidiary districts and a number of private volunteer fire protection companies. The independent districts are governed by elected Boards of Directors, while the CSAs are administered by the Board of Supervisors. The two subsidiary districts, Encinitas Fire Protection District (FPD) and San Marcos FPD are governed by the City Councils of the City of Encinitas and the City of San Marcos respectively.

These districts serve both the unincorporated area and the cities. The Vista FPD

TABLE 11-1
FIRE PROTECTION AGENCIES SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREA IN 1990

FIRE AGENCIES	NO. OF STATIONS		EMERGENCY MEDICAL LEVEL OF SERVICE
	PERM.	TEMP.	
COUNTY SERVICE AREAS			
Boulevard (#111)	1	1	First Responder Services
Campo (#112)	1	0	Basic Life Support, Transport
Elfin Forest (#107)	1	0	First Responder Services
Mount Laguna (#109)	1	0	First Responder Services
Pepper Drive (#115) ¹	1	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Palomar Mountain (#110)	0	1	First Responder Services
San Pasqual (#113)	1	0	First Responder Services
INDEPENDENT AND SUBSIDIARY DISTRICTS			
Alpine FPD	1	0	First Responder Services
Bonita/Sunnyside FPD	1	0	First Responder Services
Borrego Springs FPD	1	0	Basic Life Support, Transport
Bostonia FPD ²	1	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Crest FPD	1	0	Basic Life Support, Transport
Encinitas FPD ³	4	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Deer Springs FPD	2	0	First Responder Services
Julian/Cuyamaca FPD	2	0	First Responder Services
Lakeside FPD ²	3	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Lower Sweetwater ⁴	1	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Mootamai MWD ⁵	1	0	First Responder Services
North County FPD ⁶	7	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Pauma MWD ⁵	1	0	First Responder Services
Pine Valley FPD	1	0	First Responder Services
Ramona MWD	2	1	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Rancho Santa Fe FPD ⁷	3	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Rincon Del Diablo MWD ⁸	1	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Rural FPD	15	1	First Responder Services
San Marcos FPD ⁹	2	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
San Miguel FPD	5	1	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Valley Center FPD	1	0	First Responder Services
Vista FPD ¹⁰	3	0	Advanced Life Support, Transport
Yuima MWD ⁵	1	0	First Responder Services
FEDERAL & STATE AGENCIES	18	0	First Responder Services
California Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF)	13	0	First Responder Services
United States Forest Service (USFS)			

¹ Santee Fire Department station (all services contracted).

² *Advanced Life Support and transport is provided through CSA 69.*

³ *This district is a subsidiary district of the City of Encinitas. It serves unincorporated area and territory within the City of Encinitas.*

⁴ *National City Fire Department station (all services contracted).*

⁵ *Mootamai MWD, Pauma MWD and Yuima MWD contract with CDF for service, and this service is provided by the same CDF station.*

⁶ *Advanced Life Support service will be provided beginning in June, 1990.*

⁷ *Advanced Life Support and transport is provided through CSA 17.*

⁸ *Escondido City Fire Department Station (all services contracted).*

⁹ *This district is a subsidiary district of the City of San Marcos. It serves unincorporated area and territory within the City of San Marcos.*

¹⁰ *All services contracted to the City of Vista.*

includes only the unincorporated area adjacent to the City of Vista. Fire protection within this area is provided by the City of Vista's fire department through a Joint Powers Agreement. Valley Center FPD, Mootamai Municipal Water District (MWD), Pauma MWD, and Yuima MWD contract with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for structural fire protection.

WATERSHED AND WILDLAND FIRE PROTECTION

The United States Forest Service (USFS) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) provide watershed and wildland fire protection services within areas of the County under their jurisdiction.

CDF performs fire protection and prevention duties, including brush management and prescribed burning, on state responsibility land. Several of the fire protection districts in the rural areas contain land where the State is responsible for wildland fire protection. In these areas, CDF provides wildland fire protection, while structural fire protection is provided by the local district.

USFS is responsible for fire protection and prevention within the County on federal lands and contracted private lands within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest. USFS contracts with CDF for service on some of the National Forest land. Both CDF and USFS provide fire protection and prevention for land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Although CDF and USFS are primarily responsible for the protection of wildlands, both agencies will respond to structural and vehicular fires and medical emergencies when requested by another fire agency or when these fires threaten to spread to wildlands.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL

Emergency medical service calls typically account for about 60% of calls to fire agencies in the unincorporated area. In 1981, the State delegated responsibility for emergency medical services to the counties. In San Diego County, the Department of Health Services is designated as the region's local emergency medical services agency.

The primary functions of the Emergency Medical Service (EMS) division of the County Department of Health Services are regulating, administering, planning, and monitoring the provision of emergency medical service. Two County Service Areas, CSA 17 (San Dieguito) and CSA 69 (Heartland Paramedic), were established to provide funding for emergency ambulance service, and are administered by the County. Within both of these districts, advanced life support (paramedic) ambulance service is provided. The service provided from CSA 17 is presently contracted out to a private ambulance company, while service from CSA 69 is provided by the City of Santee and the Lakeside Fire Protection District. The County also sets standards for emergency medical training

and certification of personnel, which have a direct impact on the fire agencies providing the service.

Since local fire agencies are usually the first responder to a medical emergency, they are a key component of the emergency medical system in the unincorporated area. All fire agencies in the unincorporated area respond to emergency medical calls, and the majority of the emergency medical responders and equipment are based in fire agency facilities. The success of the emergency medical system depends on the ability of the local fire agencies to respond quickly and effectively.

Fire agency involvement in the emergency medical system is based on first arrival at the emergency scene to begin treatment and stabilization of the victim until an ambulance arrives. Some of the fire agencies also provide ambulance services. The County has established an Emergency Services Pool of Funds program. This program, which is subject to annual budgeting, enables fire agencies in the unincorporated area to earn additional funding on a per incident basis when qualified personnel provide medical services as the first responder.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INCIDENTS

Hazardous materials incidents make up a small percentage of emergency responses. However, since any of these incidents has the potential to cause major health and safety risks, the availability of rapid and effective response is critical. Response to these incidents requires highly trained personnel with expensive, specialized equipment.

Under the Hazardous Materials Incident Response Team (HIRT), a combined response with highly trained teams can be provided Countywide. HIRT is provided under a joint powers agreement between the County and all of the region's cities. In addition to providing Countywide hazardous materials incident responses, the program offers hazardous materials emergency training courses to any interested fire agencies throughout the County.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Rapid response is essential for fire protection and emergency medical service. To assess the adequacy of fire protection and emergency service facilities, a measure of emergency travel time is most appropriate. The emergency travel time is defined as the time from when a responding unit leaves a fire station to when this unit arrives at an incident, which is the facility portion of response capability. The National Fire Protection Association's Fire Protection Handbook states that for urban areas "the first arriving piece of apparatus should be at the emergency scene within five minutes of the sounding of the alarm." An assessment of response capability must, however, also be reasonable with respect to land use and density, with travel times expected to be longer in sparsely populated areas. In addition, the varied needs and circumstances of differing communities may warrant different types of equipment, and fire stations of

differing sizes.

Due to the multitude of service providers and the differences in land use of the areas served, it is difficult to assess whether or not current fire protection and emergency services facility levels are sufficient, and whether they currently meet adequate emergency travel times. It is clear that there are outlying areas of the County with very long travel times (longer than 10 minutes) for structural fire protection and emergency medical services. In addition, there is a significant amount of territory lacking any local public structural fire protection.

STRUCTURAL FIRE PROTECTION

The fire agencies serving the unincorporated area and the number of stations associated with each agency are shown in Table 11-1. In 1990, structural fire protection agencies serving the unincorporated area operated a total of 64 permanent and 5 temporary fire stations, including stations that serve both incorporated territory and unincorporated area. The locations of the permanent and temporary fire stations serving the unincorporated area are shown in Figure 11-A.

Many of the fire protection districts in the County participate in automatic aid agreements with cities and other districts, whereby districts will automatically respond to calls within a specified portion of an adjoining district. All districts participate in mutual aid agreements with cities and other districts, whereby they will respond outside of their jurisdictions when requested.

Approximately 98% of the population and structures, and 58% of the total land in the unincorporated area, is served by a public agency with structural fire protection responsibilities. The remaining approximately 7,000 residents living in 2,650 structures on 1,550 square miles are not served by any special district: they are either served by a private volunteer fire company or have no local structural fire protection. Within the unserved territory and the dependent districts (i.e., CSAs), the County Chief Fire Inspector is responsible for fire prevention, including the enforcement of County codes and ordinances relating to fire safety.

WATERSHED AND WILDLAND PROTECTION

In terms of land area protected, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) is the major provider of watershed and wildland fire protection in the County serving approximately 2,200 square miles, or over 50% of the County's total land area. CDF operates 18 stations and 1 air attack base. Ten stations are closed during the non-fire season (4 months of the year); 8 are open year-round, in part to provide structural protection for districts that contract for service from CDF. To protect federal wildlands, the United States Forest Service (USFS) operates 13 temporary fire

stations, 11 of which are closed during the non-fire season.

FIGURE 11-A GOES HERE

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

The level of emergency medical service of each fire agency is shown in Table 11-1. Some fire protection districts have agreements with one or more private ambulance companies to provide transport and backup service on a rotation basis.

The County is responsible for ensuring the provision of emergency medical service throughout the unincorporated area, and most of this service is provided by fire protection districts. In some areas of the County, the fire protection agencies (including CSA 17 and CSA 69), provide advanced life support (paramedic) emergency ambulance service. Other areas receive only first responder services from fire protection agencies, or lack a direct service provider for emergency medical service. The County provides some funding for ambulance service in areas that lack a direct service provider. In a portion of this area, other agencies, including a private contractor in the Campo area, two Sheriff's ambulances, and the City of San Clemente Fire Department, supply ambulance service, although emergency travel times tend to be long.

In addition, LifeFlight, a helicopter advanced life support service that is provided by UCSD Medical Center, will respond to any area where it can land, weather permitting. This aerial transport system can be dispatched by any authorized responder, such as a fire agency or the Sheriff. The Sheriff's helicopter (ASTREA) provides aerial rescue and also serves as a backup to LifeFlight in transporting trauma and emergency patients.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INCIDENTS

Under the Hazardous Materials Incident Response Team program, highly trained personnel with specialized equipment is available to respond to hazardous materials incidents Countywide. The personnel and equipment are supplied by the Hazardous Materials Management Section of the Environmental Health Division of the County Department of Health Services, and the City of San Diego Fire Department. In addition, local fire protection agencies will respond to hazardous materials incidents with varying levels of training and equipment.

FUNDING METHODS

Sources of revenue for financing structural fire protection and emergency services facilities include: property taxes; the Special District Augmentation Fund (SDAF); Fire Mitigation Fees; grants and loans; County Service Area assessments; special taxes and benefit assessments; Mello-Roos bonds; and general obligation bonds. The San Diego Ranger Unit of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection is funded by the state, and the United States Forest Service is funded by the federal government. The facilities and equipment for the Hazardous Materials Incident Response Team is funded under a joint powers agreement including the County and all of the cities in the

region. The County's fair share portion is paid through the General Fund.

PROPERTY TAXES AND THE SPECIAL DISTRICT AUGMENTATION FUND

Most independent fire protection agencies receive the majority of their revenue from property taxes and the Special District Augmentation Fund, which is apportioned by the County. Most of this revenue is used for operations and maintenance, although it may be used for capital facilities expenditures.

FIRE MITIGATION FEES

In December 1985, the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance establishing a Fire Mitigation Fee program for districts in the unincorporated area. Under this program, districts providing fire protection and emergency services may charge per square foot fees on new construction to mitigate the impacts of new development on their facilities. These fees are collected by the County at the building permit stage, and distributed to the appropriate districts. The use of the fee revenue is limited to expenditures on capital facilities and equipment made necessary by new development.

In 1990, most of the districts participated in the Fire Mitigation Fee program. To qualify for the program, a fire district must adopt a resolution certifying that it has a need for the fee, establishing the amount to be collected (not exceeding the fee ceiling), and agreeing to use fee proceeds to finance facilities and equipment needs generated by new development.

GRANTS AND LOANS

Grants and loans are also potential sources of revenue for financing fire protection and emergency services facilities and equipment. The federal Farmers Home Administration, through its Community Facility Loans Program, makes loans to rural communities for fire and rescue facilities. The State Assistance for Fire Equipment (SAFE) program is administered by the California Office of Emergency Services Fire and Rescue Division. Both the federal and state programs help rural communities by making loans at preferential rates.

Federal funds for fire protection and emergency services facilities are also available through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for low-income communities. The CDBG program is administered by the County through a grant application process. These funds may be used in eligible communities for assistance with capital expenditures, including fire protection and emergency services facilities and equipment.

COUNTY SERVICE AREA ASSESSMENTS

A County Service Area is a special district governed by the Board of Supervisors in which residents pay for and receive facilities and services. In the unincorporated area in 1990, there were seven CSAs that provided fire protection, and two that provided

paramedic service. Most CSAs levy benefit assessments to supplement funding for facilities and services. These benefit assessments require approval by a two-thirds vote within the area of benefit.

ISSUES

1. Facility deficiencies exist in many areas.

Discussion: Some of the districts, especially in the outlying areas, currently have deficiencies in needed facilities and equipment. In addition, most outlying areas do not have the financial resources to meet the facility levels and emergency travel times of more urban areas. As urban development pushes out into these outlying areas, existing facilities need to be expanded and upgraded to meet increased needs.

2. A portion of the County is not served by a local public structural fire protection agency.

Discussion: In 1990, there were over 1,550 square miles of territory in the unincorporated area of San Diego County that lacked a local public provider of structural fire protection and emergency medical service. In 1990, this area included about 42% of the unincorporated area, but was sparsely populated, and contained only about 7,000 inhabitants in about 2,650 structures. In these areas, there is a need to augment fire prevention and protection requirements, define the limits of development, and establish policies addressing emergency medical service facilities and responsibilities.

3. Water availability for fire protection is a major concern in portions of the County that are dependent on groundwater.

Discussion: Certain development proposals in outlying areas of the County that are dependent on groundwater may warrant fire hydrants to ensure adequate fire protection. For these projects, water storage tanks and other typically used measures may not be sufficient to meet the potential fire suppression demands. However, fire hydrants, which require centralized water systems, are not always geologically and economically feasible in these areas. Coordination among affected fire agencies and the County is necessary to address this problem.

4. There is a need for coordinated master fire protection and emergency services facility planning and increased cooperation among the multitude of service providers in the unincorporated area.

Discussion: Currently, each fire agency prepares facility plans for its individual district. Coordinated master facilities planning and enhanced cooperation among fire protection agencies would greatly improve efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of fire protection and emergency services facilities in the County. The focus of these efforts should be the identification and prioritization of areas with fire protection and emergency services facility needs, and effective planning to cooperatively meet these needs.

5. New development creates significant impacts on fire protection and emergency services facilities.

Discussion: As new development occurs, the number of people and structures that must be protected increases, and consequently the need for emergency responses also increases. This increase in demand for services generated by new development creates the need for expansion of fire protection and emergency services facilities and equipment. In order to maintain existing facility levels, new facilities must be built and new equipment must be purchased to keep pace with the increased demands caused by new development.

6. Many fire protection agencies respond to medical and other emergencies for non-residents.

Many of the fire protection districts in the County contain regional recreation areas that draw many visitors from outside their districts. Non-residents often require emergency medical and other services from these fire protection agencies, although non-residents do not contribute to funding facilities and services within these districts.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

MINIMIZATION OF THE LOSS OF LIFE AND PROPERTY FROM FIRES AND MEDICAL EMERGENCIES.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Sufficient fire and emergency services facilities to meet established emergency travel time objectives to minimize fire and emergency risk. The level of sufficient fire and emergency services facilities shall be based on the following factors:

- a) Demands for fire protection and emergency services;

- b) Geographic and demographic considerations;
- c) Types and number of structures requiring additional companies to meet Insurance Service Office (ISO) guidelines for fire flow requirements; and
- d) Other special needs for fire suppression and emergency services, for example, recreation areas and the petroleum industry.

The emergency travel times listed below are minimum objectives that apply to the entire unincorporated area. These objectives do not preclude the adoption of more stringent provisions addressing fire protection and emergency service facility levels within a community or subregional plan or by a local public district that provides fire protection.

Land Use Category	Travel Time Maximum	Land Use Category Definition
Town:	5 minutes	Single-family residential lots of less than two acres, or more intensive uses such as multi-family residential. Includes all industrial development and all commercial development except neighborhood commercial.
Estate:	10 minutes	Single-family residential lots from two acres to four acres in size. Includes neighborhood commercial development.
Rural:	20 minutes	Large lot single-family residential and agricultural development. Lot sizes of greater than four acres.

Policy 1.1: The County will assist the fire agencies' efforts to achieve the levels of fire protection and emergency services facilities established in Objective 1.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Accomplish computerized emergency travel time mapping of the entire unincorporated area. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Assess the adequacy of existing and planned fire protection and emergency services facilities to identify the specific facility needs of plan areas through the Community and Subregional Plan Update process. Include community values for fire protection and emergency services and input from the affected fire protection districts in this assessment. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Encourage and support the efforts of fire protection agencies to upgrade their emergency medical service to advanced life support (paramedic). [DHS]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Encourage fire protection agencies to site facilities in the most suitable location to serve the present and projected population, and to consider the following factors during site selection:

- a) Availability of the property proposed as a site;
 - b) Ability to meet emergency travel time objectives for current and future development in the intended service area;
 - c) Proximity to a pool of volunteer firefighters, when appropriate;
 - d) Ability of the site to support the appropriate facility to serve current and future development in the intended service area;
 - e) Distances from other fire stations, including those operated by neighboring structural fire protection districts;
 - f) Safe access to roadways in emergency responses;
 - g) Special needs for fire suppression, and emergency services, including needs created by recreation areas and industrial land uses; and
 - h) Ability to meet any adopted local community facility level standards.
- [DPLU]

Policy 1.2: The County will ensure the availability of adequate fire and emergency services facilities in the review of discretionary land development applications, and require appropriate fire prevention and protection measures.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Refer projects subject to discretionary review to the appropriate fire protection agencies for fire protection requirements and conditions. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Require, as a basis of approval, a finding that sufficient fire protection and emergency service facilities are available or will be available concurrent with need for all discretionary projects. The finding of sufficient fire protection and emergency service facilities will be based on the provisions of Objective 1 and the requirements and information from the responsible fire agency. In applying the provisions of Objective 1, the proposed land uses and the smallest proposed residential lot will be used to determine the appropriate emergency travel time for each project proposal. If the appropriate emergency travel time cannot be met for a proposed project, the discretionary project will be denied unless sufficient mitigation measures are included as a basis of approval based on the recommendations of the Director and the responsible agency providing fire protection. [DPLU]

Policy 1.3: A program will be established to address the needs of areas lacking adequate fire protection and emergency services facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.3.1: When required by the fire protection

agency in areas lacking local public structural fire protection and within the sphere of influence of the agency, condition the approval of discretionary projects on annexation to that agency. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.3.2: Formulate and adopt specific limitations on the division and use of land in areas with emergency travel times longer than 20 minutes and areas lacking local public structural fire protection to ensure that higher intensity land uses are not approved in these areas until sufficient fire protection is assured. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.3.3: Cooperatively develop a strategy with the fire protection agencies addressing emergency medical service facilities and responsibilities in areas of the County lacking a local provider of these services. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.3.4: Require appropriate preventive and self-protective measures prior to issuance of all building permits, including single family residential development, in areas lacking local public structural fire protection, and within County Service Areas that lack adequate fire protection and emergency services facilities. Physical conditions relating to water availability, access, climate and vegetation shall determine the appropriate preventive and self-protective measures. These measures shall be specified in the County Fire Code and/or County Building Code, and may include:

- a) Creation and maintenance of fuel breaks;
 - b) Fire Extinguishers;
 - c) Class A or Class B roofing materials;
 - d) Fire resistive construction materials;
 - e) Water storage tanks;
 - f) Fire sprinklers complying with standards for fire sprinklers established in the most current County Fire Code; and
 - g) Other measures as established by the Board of Supervisors.
- [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.3.5: Work with affected fire protection agencies to cooperatively develop guidelines for appropriate water provision requirements necessary for fire protection in groundwater dependent areas. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Equitable and sufficient funding for fire protection and emergency services facilities.

Policy 2.1: New development shall be required to finance its full and fair share of the facility and equipment needs that it generates.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Utilize the Fire Mitigation Fee Ordinance to enable fire protection agencies to meet the facility and equipment needs generated by new development. [DPLU]

Policy 2.2: The County will encourage the use of new funding sources to remedy existing facility deficiencies.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Assist fire agencies' efforts to obtain state and federal grants for fire protection and emergency service facilities and equipment whenever appropriate. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Encourage and assist the efforts of fire districts to obtain funding from appropriate new sources to achieve the levels of fire protection and emergency services facilities established in Objective 1. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Regional cooperation to efficiently provide fire protection and emergency services.

Policy 3.1: Regional cooperation among fire protection and emergency services providers and the County will be advocated and supported.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Encourage efforts to continue and to expand use of automatic aid and mutual aid agreements. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Promote regional fire protection and emergency services planning that would coordinate capital expenditures throughout the County and increase efficiency in the provision of these facilities. [DPLU, DPW, DHS]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Ensure active participation of all affected fire agencies in development and decision-making on policies and regulations that would affect fire protection and prevention. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 3.1.4: Seek agreement of all service providers in the County on improvements to regional communication systems. [DIS]

SECTION 12. WASTEWATER

OVERVIEW

Most land uses create sewage which must be effectively collected, treated and reused or disposed of in order to ensure the public's health and safety. In the unincorporated areas of San Diego County this is done either through individual septic systems or community sewer systems. Community sewer systems are generally used where densities are high, and where a number of individual users have a need or desire for a single, combined collection, treatment and reuse or disposal scheme. Septic systems are typically used in rural areas with individual systems operating independently of each other. Such areas typically cannot financially support a sewer system during their early development.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In San Diego County community sewer service is provided by municipalities and independent¹ and dependent sewerage agencies. The latter are administered by the County Board of Supervisors acting as the Board of Directors. Table 13-1 shows the agencies providing sewerage services to the unincorporated area. Figure 13-A shows the treatment and disposal facilities utilized by the sewerage agencies providing service to the unincorporated area. Each agency provides collection and transmission of sewage. Treatment and reuse or disposal of the wastewater is provided through one of five mechanisms. These include the use of (1) the San Diego Metropolitan Sewerage System (Metro) for treatment and ocean disposal, (2) Joint Powers Agreements for treatment and ocean disposal, (3) individual treatment and re-use or inland disposal, (4) individual treatment by a district with use of the Oceanside Outfall for disposal, and (5) treatment and disposal by another agency.

Generally, those agencies near the City of San Diego are members of the Metro system and use this system for treatment and effluent disposal. A number of agencies also use a combination of Metro and inland treatment and disposal. Agencies near the County's coastal areas are generally providing effluent disposal through an ocean outfall. Inland agencies provide treatment and disposal through percolation of effluent into the soil, and reuse through irrigation of native vegetation, agricultural crops and landscaped areas where appropriate, and/or through ocean outfall. Figure 12-B shows the jurisdictions in which community sewer systems are used.

¹ Independent sewer districts have independent boards of directors, and provide sewer service to their customers under specific regulations as allowed by their legal authority. Independent sewer districts include sanitary districts, community service districts, and county water districts.

TABLE 12-1
AGENCIES PROVIDING SEWER SERVICE TO THE UNINCORPORATED
AREA OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY IN 1990

AGENCIES	DISPOSAL MECHANISM
DEPENDENT SEWERING DISTRICTS	
4-S Ranch ¹	Inland Reuse
Alpine Sanitation	Metro, Pt. Loma Outfall
Buena Sanitation	Encina Outfall
Julian Sanitation	Inland Reuse
Lakeside Sanitation	Metro, Pt. Loma Outfall
Pine Valley Sanitation	Inland Reuse
Rancho Cielo Sanitation ²	Inland Reuse
Spring Valley Sanitation	Metro, Pt. Loma Outfall
Wintergardens Sewer Maintenance	Metro, Pt. Loma Outfall
INDEPENDENT SEWERING DISTRICTS	
Borrego Springs Park Community Services	Inland Reuse
Borrego Water	Inland Reuse
Cardiff Sanitation	San Elijo Outfall
Encinitas Sanitary	Encina Outfall
Fairbanks Ranch Community Services	Inland Reuse
Fallbrook Sanitary	Inland Reuse/Oceanside Outfall
Leucadia County Water	Encina Outfall
Otay Water	Inland Reuse, Metro
Padre Dam Municipal Water	Inland Reuse, Metro
Pauma Valley Community Services	Inland Reuse
Rainbow Municipal Water	Inland Reuse/Oceanside Outfall
Ramona Municipal Water	Inland Reuse
Rancho Santa Fe Community Services	Inland Reuse/San Elijo Outfall
Valley Center Municipal Water	Inland Reuse
Vallecitos Water	Inland Reuse
Whispering Palms Community Services	Inland Reuse

¹ Construction of this facility has been completed. Operations are expected to begin in March of 1991.

² Facilities proposed, construction has not begun.

FIGURE 12-A GOES HERE

FIGURE 12-B GOES HERE

TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL METHODS

Metropolitan Sewerage System

The San Diego Metropolitan Sewerage System (Metro) provides sewer service to the City of San Diego, nine other municipalities and six special districts serving unincorporated areas in San Diego County. These districts are the Spring Valley, Lakeside and Alpine Sanitation Districts, Otay Water District, Winter Gardens Sewer Maintenance District and the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. The 450 square miles of Metro service area stretches from Del Mar in the north to the Mexican border in the south, and from Alpine in the east to the Pacific Ocean in the west. Facilities in the Metro System include the Point Loma advanced primary wastewater treatment plant, ocean outfall, pump stations, interconnecting interceptors, and the Fiesta Island sludge beds.

Wastewater from each of the participating agencies flows into the Metro System and undergoes advanced primary treatment at the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. The treated effluent is then discharged to the ocean off the coast of Point Loma more than two miles offshore. As operating agency of the Metro System, the City of San Diego has embarked on a program to maximize water reclamation and to provide for secondary treatment of wastewater as required by the Clean Water Act. Several planning studies have been undertaken to address system modifications to achieve secondary treatment as currently required by the Clean Water Act. These studies include the 1977 Metro System Facilities Plan, the 1981 "Metro II" Facilities Plan, the 1989 Framework Plan Report for Modifications to the Metropolitan Sewerage System and the May 1990 Project Report for Modifications to the Metropolitan Sewerage System, Recommended Plan, Volumes I through IX. The studies recommended programs for upgrading the Point Loma Plant from primary to secondary treatment and constructing a new plant in southern San Diego County for secondary treatment and disposal through a new ocean outfall near the international border. The proposed water reclamation program includes reclamation plants in Poway, North City (San Diego), Mission Valley, Santee, Otay River Valley and Tijuana River Valley.

Joint Sewerage Agencies

Two Joint Sewerage Agencies provide sewer service to areas of the unincorporated County. These are the Encina Joint Sewerage Agency and the San Elijo Joint Sewerage Agency. The participating entities enter into a Joint Powers Agreement for the construction and operation of a common treatment and disposal facility.

The City of Vista, City of Carlsbad, Buena Sanitation District, Vallecitos County Water District, Leucadia County Water District and Encinitas Sanitary District have entered into a joint powers agreement for the operation of the Encina Water Pollution Control Facility, located on the Pacific Ocean in the City of Carlsbad. The treatment plant began operation in 1965 and has an ultimate service area of approximately 117 square miles.

The Cardiff Sanitation District, the Solana Beach Sanitation District and the City of Escondido have entered into a Joint Powers Agreement for the operation of the San Elijo Sewerage Agency, located on the Pacific Ocean just north of the San Elijo Lagoon. The treatment plant began operation in 1966 and has an ultimate service area of approximately 29 square miles.

Inland Reuse

A number of sewer-providing agencies operate inland disposal systems, ultimately disposing of wastewater through methods that will allow direct or indirect reuse. Under this system, wastewater is piped to the treatment plant, undergoes treatment at a secondary level or higher, and is then disposed of through one or more methods. Options for direct reuse of discharge include crop irrigation, golf course or parkland irrigation, and non-contact industrial and manufacturing uses. Options for indirect reuse of effluent discharge include live stream discharge, basin recharge and direct percolation into the soil, which eventually results in the ability to reuse the water.

Septic Disposal Systems

Areas outside of sewer district boundaries dispose of their sewage through individual septic systems. A majority of these systems are comprised of a settling tank and a system of pipes extending from the tank into a leach field. The sewage flows into the settling tank where most of the suspended solids settle to the bottom. The remaining effluent flows out of the tank through a series of perforated pipes and percolates into the soil, where organic material and pathogens are removed before it reaches the water table.

The failure of a septic system can result in serious health and safety problems. If the effluent discharged through the leach field is not adequately purified before it reaches the water table, contamination of local water sources may cause public health problems. If the effluent rises to the ground surface, it can cause public health hazards by direct contact or ingestion, or it can flow into and pollute surface bodies of water. Additionally, if the soil is too impermeable to allow adequate percolation, the effluent can back up into the structure's plumbing system and the system becomes unusable.

To avoid these problems, the design, location and placement of septic systems is regulated by the County Department of Health Services. Specific criteria addressing the rate of percolation, distance from existing bodies of water, structures or property lines, and location with respect to other septic systems must all be satisfied prior to installation of a septic system.

Despite the precautions taken, septic systems sometimes fail. When this occurs, there are several options available to restore septic service. The preferred option is to utilize the expansion area established when a septic

system is installed. The property owner is required to set aside a 100% expansion area for leach field placement in case of system failure. If the system fails, the expansion area can be utilized to install a new septic system.

In cases where the expansion area is no longer available or is incapable of supporting a septic system, other means may be used to provide for sewage disposal and allow occupancy of a structure to continue:

- o Hook-up to the sewer system. If the property is located within 200 feet of an existing sewer line, hook-up to the sewer system is required. If a conventional hook-up to the sewer system using gravity flow is not feasible, hook-up could also take the form of a glide or grinder system. With the glide system, the effluent flows into an on-site settling tank and a majority of the solids settle out. The remaining effluent is then pumped from the tank through a pressure pipe system to an off-site treatment plant. This type of system is approved only when sub-surface conditions or terrain make its engineering and economic feasibility superior to conventional sewer connection systems. With the grinder system the effluent is pumped through an on-site grinder pump that breaks down the solids. The effluent is then pumped through a pressure pipe system to an off-site treatment plant. The use of both the glide and the grinder are stringently controlled, and are rarely approved.
- o Pumping to a higher elevation. If a suitable area for disposal exists on the parcel at an elevation higher than the structure, the system can be relocated and effluent pumped to the new location.
- o Horizontal seepage pit. This mechanism is sometimes used as a last resort. It incorporates a box-like pit requiring less area than a leach field but functional only in excellent soil conditions and where the water table is deep.
- o Vertical seepage pit. Use of this mechanism is restricted to areas where the groundwater is already degraded, since the potential for groundwater contamination is much greater. Vertical seepage pits cannot be installed within one-quarter mile of any water wells.

Repair to or renovation of failing septic systems is subject to approval by the Department of Health Services and are evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

ALTERNATIVES TO DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER

Wastewater Reclamation and Reuse

Current regulatory requirements, economic considerations of wastewater treatment and concerns for the long-term availability of water in San Diego County have resulted in a greater awareness of the need for wastewater reclamation and water conservation. Table 12-2 lists the public sewerage agencies serving the unincorporated area practicing wastewater reclamation. Wastewater treatment technology is capable of removing many types of contaminants, and current State Department of Health Services requirements

allow water reuse for any purpose except drinking (California Administrative Code, Title 22). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (the agency responsible for assuring that California's waters, both surface and subsurface, are not adversely impacted by effluent discharge) must also approve all reclamation projects. Districts such as the Ramona Municipal Water District, Otay Water District, Fallbrook Sanitary District, Fairbanks Ranch Community Services District, Whispering Palms Community Services District, Rancho Santa Fe Community Services District, Rancho Cielo Community Services District, Valley Center Municipal Water District and Padre Dam Municipal Water District have developed proposed markets for at least a portion of the reclaimed wastewater generated. The Clean Water Program for Greater San Diego has identified a potential market of 70,000 acre feet per year by 2010 which can be met with a system of water reclamation plants with total capacity of 120 million gallons per day. The market area to be served by the system includes portions of Otay Water District, Padre Dam Water District, Sweetwater District and Helix Water District.

The San Diego County Water Authority has established a goal to reclaim 100,000 acre-feet of water annually by 2010. This would represent approximately 12% of San Diego's estimated total water demand in 2010. There are, however, potential problems to be solved in successfully reusing water. These include:

- o The need to construct storage facilities to contain excess reclaimed water during high periods of flow because of variable rates of flow of raw wastewater and the demand fluctuations for the reused product;
- o Lack of funding for treatment plants and the distribution system required to transport the reclaimed water;
- o Difficulty in the siting of treatment facilities due to geographic requirements and public opposition;
- o The need to maintain the quality of the reclaimed wastewater in order to provide a safe supply to the consumers and the necessary quality of the reuse market; and
- o The need for each jurisdiction to adopt an ordinance or regulations allowing for the reuse of reclaimed wastewater.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

The sewage treatment system in the San Diego metropolitan region (Metro) is undergoing major changes. The main sewage issue facing the region in the 1990's is the requirement to upgrade the treatment level of the Metro System facilities.

**TABLE 12-2
AGENCIES SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREA
UNDERTAKING WATER RECLAMATION IN 1990**

SEWERING AGENCY	TYPE OF REUSE
DEPENDENT AGENCIES	
4-S Ranch	Irrigation
Julian Sanitation District	Irrigation
Mt. Woodson Ranch Sanitation District	Irrigation
Pine Valley Sanitation District	Percolation
Rancho Cielo Sanitation District	Irrigation
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES	
Borrego Springs Park CSD	Percolation
Borrego Water District	Percolation
Fairbanks Ranch Sanitation District	Percolation
Fallbrook Sanitary District	Irrigation
Otay Water District	Irrigation
Padre Dam MWD	Lake and River Discharge, Municipal and Industrial Reuse
Pauma Valley CSD	Percolation
Rainbow MWD	Percolation
Ramona MWD	Irrigation
Rancho Santa Fe CSD	Percolation
Vallecitos Water District	Irrigation
Valley Center MWD	Percolation
Whispering Palms CSD	Irrigation, Percolation

To meet the sewage treatment standards established in the Federal Clean Water Act, the City of San Diego must upgrade the Metro System treatment level from advanced primary to secondary treatment. While discussion continues on whether or not this upgrade in treatment is necessary, the City is complying with the Act and is in the process of planning and designing needed improvements to upgrade its facilities to provide a secondary treatment level. Improvements will include the expansion of existing facilities, construction of additional treatment plants, a new ocean outfall site and a dual piping system to increase the use of reclaimed water. Additionally, to meet the requirements of the State Ocean Plan, Metro may be required to extend the length of the existing ocean outfall.

Another major problem facing some of the local sewerage agencies is a lack of capacity in existing pipelines to carry the increasing amount of sewage. A lack of line capacity has caused a few agencies to restrict or deny new sewer connections to their facilities. Solving this problem will require large capital investments in new transmission lines to transfer larger volumes of sewage.

Lack of plant capacity has also resulted in a refusal by a few agencies to allow new connections to their system. When a sewer agency has committed all of the remaining capacity in its treatment facilities, it will refuse to grant any additional connections to the system. Traditionally, service is not granted until existing facilities are expanded or new facilities are

constructed.

FUNDING METHODS

Many of the traditional revenue sources used to finance improvements and expansions of sewer facilities are no longer available. Agencies providing sewer service have had to develop alternate funding sources to expand and/or upgrade their facilities to meet the increasing needs being placed on them.

DEVELOPMENT FEES

Two types of fees are typically charged to new development to pay the cost of providing sewer service. The first, a sewage capacity charge, is paid by a developer to a sewer agency when purchasing sewer line and treatment capacity. A connection fee or hook-up charge is also paid to the sewer agency for the cost of connecting sewer lateral(s) from the development to an existing line in the sewer system.

BONDS

Prior to Proposition 13, sewer agencies utilized General Obligation and Revenue Bonds as funding sources for expensive capital projects. Proposition 13, however, virtually eliminated the use of General Obligation Bonds and increased the reliance on Revenue Bonds to finance capital improvements. Revenue Bonds are retired by an agency's sewer service charges, and annexation and connection fees.

ANNEXATION FEES

Annexation fees are per-acre charges to property annexing to a sewer agency. The fee, typically composed of a flat rate plus a per-acre charge, varies from agency to agency. The fee is assessed to ensure that the property contributes its fair share towards the cost of the sewer infrastructure, since prior to annexation it did not pay property taxes or contribute other funds to the sewer district. The amount of funding obtained from this source depends upon the amount of development occurring in the unserved areas adjacent to an agency and requiring annexation.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The most common source of new and upgraded sewer facilities is developer contributions as a requirement of the discretionary permit process. If the development requires sewer service, it must make provision for the service with the appropriate agency. Depending on the size, type, location and needs of the project and the sewer agency, one or several of the following may be required: purchasing additional capacity for the serving district from another agency; paying to improve existing sewage lines or construct new lines; constructing pump stations; or improving or expanding the treatment capacity or level of an existing plant. In some cases, the developer constructs transmission and treatment facilities and dedicates the completed facilities to a sewer agency.

GRANTS

Historically, State and Federal grants have been valuable sources of funds to construct, expand or upgrade sewer facilities. Major sources of grant funding to this region have been the Clean Water Act, Federal Farmers Home Administration, State Water Resources Control Board, Federal Emergency Management Act, Community Development Block Grants and the Federal Bureau of Reclamations. Grants, however, are becoming increasingly difficult to obtain, and cannot be relied on for future facility needs.

OTHER SOURCES

Other sources of revenues for sewer facilities include establishment of a benefit assessment fee, increased use of different types of bonds, redevelopment funds, special taxes, private donations and lease revenues.

ISSUES

1. The Metro system is nearing capacity.

Discussion: Current use by all Metro member agencies is nearing the capacity of the Metro system. When the Metro system was established, some agencies were allocated capacity in excess of their immediate needs. In the past, this excess capacity has sometimes been transferred from one agency to another, allowing member agencies to adjust their abilities to provide service at critical time of need. As the Metro system nears its calculated capacity, this ability to adjust may be restricted. As development continues, member agencies will be forced to look to other agencies or to provide their own treatment and disposal facilities to continue to provide additional service capacity.

Additionally, some portions of the Metro system are nearing capacity limitations due to existing pipe sizing. In order to provide service to new development in these areas, existing facilities will have to be expanded or new facilities will have to be built. These problems exist separately from the issue of primary versus secondary treatment.

2. The provision of sewer service is affected by external factors.

Discussion: There are a number of external situations that affect the availability of sewer service. Factors such as a sudden change in the rate of development, particularly multi-family residential projects, or flows higher than those expected can result in significant impacts on the availability of sewer service.

With proper engineering and coordination with land use planning, agencies providing wastewater services can foretell with reasonable certainty both the availability and the cost of wastewater services. To do this, districts rely on current information provided to them by the

local planning entities. It is important that, where changes in land use plans affect local sewer agencies, these changes be coordinated closely with the sewer agencies to minimize the impacts on their ability to provide services.

3. Wastewater reclamation is a potential water source for the region.

Discussion: According to a 1987 water reuse study², reclaimed water production for direct reuse for nonpotable water needs currently represents about two percent of the total effluent from treatment plants in the San Diego region. The remainder is discharged to the ocean or percolated into groundwater basins. While it is not economically feasible to construct and operate facilities needed to reclaim all of the wastewater generated in the region, reclaiming a greater portion would decrease our reliance upon imported water.

4. The creation of sanitation districts within the boundaries of sewer-providing municipal water districts can result in problems of coordination and concern regarding compatibility of facilities and expansion of facilities.

Discussion: Most districts providing sewer service are authorized to provide such service throughout their jurisdiction. In some cases, however, a district may not have such authority. When a development application that would require sewer service is submitted for an area within the boundaries of a sewer-providing agency, but outside the area where the agency is authorized to provide sewer service, the project may be approved subject to formation of a separate sewer agency. Such requests usually involve the formation of a County dependent sanitation district. When this is proposed, the Board of Supervisors and LAFCo will consider the potential difficulties that may arise. Joint plans dealing with levels of service or expansion or construction of facilities must be cooperatively developed prior to formation and approval of a new agency.

5. Finding appropriate sites for the disposal of sludge material is becoming increasingly difficult.

Discussion: Sewering agencies are finding it more difficult to properly dispose of sludge material, due to new and proposed sludge handling regulations and public concerns. Currently, methods of sludge disposal include composting, disposal in landfills, reintroduction into the Metro or Encina systems and utilization as a soil amendment. Regulations proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency may make it more

² San Diego County Water Authority, San Diego Area Water Reuse Study, Volume 1 - Overview Report. September, 1987, pg. 9.

difficult to dispose of sludge through soil amendment or landfilling of non-composted sludge. Increasing the level of treatment to secondary at Encina, San Elijo and Point Loma will generate a much greater amount of sludge for disposal. Additionally, decreasing landfill capacity and the increasing amount of sewage entering the Metro and Encina systems have further compounded the problem of sludge disposal and increased the need to find alternative disposal mechanisms.

6. The extension of sewer systems into rural areas can be growth-inducing.

Discussion: Extending sewage transmission and treatment facilities to previously unserved rural areas can result in an increased intensity of development. The rate or intensity of development that can be accommodated by a sewer system is often incompatible with the character of a rural community's land use goals. The Land Use Element and Community Plans identify those areas where urban development is planned to occur. These areas include (1) Country Towns, (2) lands that are identified as areas to direct near-term urban development (designated as Current Urban Development Areas), and (3) lands that are held in low density uses until adjacent areas infill and services can be provided at levels necessary for urban densities (Future Urban Development Areas). Sewer service is acceptable and often expected within these areas to accommodate the type of development allowed. Additionally, higher densities are typically required to financially support the development of a community sewer system.

Development outside of these areas (outside of the urban limit line) is planned at lower densities which typically cannot support a community sewer system. These areas are expected to be served by individual septic systems. Extension of sewer service into these areas often leads to requests for increased densities both because the larger lot sizes are no longer needed to accommodate a septic system, and because community sewer systems are expensive to install. Thus, extension of sewer service often leads to conflicts with a community's land use and community character goals.

7. The use of package treatment plants represents a potential solution to many of the sewerage problems encountered in the region but may also result in adverse environmental or community impacts.

Discussion: Package treatment plants, when properly sited and operated, can be used to overcome problems resulting from inability to use septic systems or insufficient capacity in existing facilities. Package treatment plants may also provide the ability to produce reclaimed water at a site in close proximity to potential users, eliminating the need to construct an extensive piping system to transport the water.

To successfully use package treatment plants, several potential problems must be addressed and resolved. The introduction of sewage treatment facilities may be growth inducing. Additionally, if not properly sited and controlled, package treatment plants can fragment sewer service in the region rather than complement it. Environmental impacts and financial problems can also result from package treatment plants. To avoid these problems, the need for the facility, the existing land uses, and the size, location and operator of the facility need to be carefully considered as part of the land development review process.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL
AVAILABLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL CAPACITY CONSISTENT WITH THE LAND USES IN THE GENERAL PLAN.

OBJECTIVE 1:

The ongoing planning, management and development of sewage conveyance, treatment and disposal facilities to adequately meet future demands.

Policy 1.1: Land use planning, which is the responsibility of the County, will be coordinated with sewer system planning, which is the responsibility of facility providers.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Establish mechanisms to work closely with the applicable sewer agencies during the community and subregional plan update process, and during the review of general plan amendments and rezones, to obtain their input on the impact of all proposed changes in the density or intensity of land uses on their ability to provide the service. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: In order to coordinate land use

planning with sewer facilities planning:

- a) Encourage the preparation of sewer master plans that are coordinated with community plans to ensure planned land uses can be served by planned sewer improvements.
- b) Phase land development with the actual extension/expansion of sewer facilities.

[DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Furnish data to the facility providers about development planned for an area in order to encourage and support the development of sewer master plans, particularly for those areas of the County approaching existing sewer facility capacities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Cooperate with agencies providing sewer service to identify appropriate recycling and disposal alternatives for sludge materials. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Where feasible, encourage the siting of sewer facilities in the locations most suited to the needs of present and projected future residents of the locality and the region. [DPLU]

Policy 1.2: Discretionary land development projects will only be approved if the service provider reasonably expects that wastewater treatment and disposal will be available concurrent with need, and that all appropriate requirements will be met through conditions placed on project approval.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Refer projects subject to discretionary review that require the use of sewers to the appropriate sewer agency for recommended conditions required to extend sewer service to the project. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Refer discretionary projects proposing the use of septic disposal systems to the Department of Health Services for approval of layout and recommended conditions. [DPLU, DHS]

Implementation Measure 1.2.3: Prior to approval of a discretionary permit project, require evidence from the sewer district that service is available, or is reasonably expected to be available, to serve that project concurrent with need. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.4: Include affected special districts in the review of plans to form an alternative sewer agency within their district boundaries but outside of their sewer improvement area. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.5: Require, as a condition of development approval, that projects requiring sewer service annex

to the special district responsible for providing the service.
[DPLU]

Policy 1.3: All land development projects requiring the use of sewage conveyance, treatment and disposal facilities shall obtain a commitment of service from the appropriate district prior to land preparation and construction.

Implementation Measure 1.3.1: Require commitment of availability of sewer service from the applicable sewer district before a subdivision map can record; before approval of a Certificate of Compliance in lieu of a Tentative Map, a Tentative Parcel Map or to correct a subdivision violation; before issuance of building or grading permit(s) or prior to establishing use in reliance on a Major Use Permit, or prior to occupancy or use in reliance on the permit if building and/or grading permits are not required; or before a rezone that would result in an increase in density or intensity of use is approved. Such commitment must be valid for the period specified in County regulations, and may be based on existing facilities or on approved facilities under construction.
[DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.3.2: Prior to the issuance of a permit for building or for the grading of a site in preparation for construction, require permanent commitment to serve from the applicable sewer district; or when applicable, require approval from the Department of Health Services of a private sewage disposal system. [DPLU, DPW]

Policy 1.4: The County will coordinate with sewer districts and other agencies on sewer issues of mutual concern.

Implementation Measure 1.4.1: Request that districts and the City of San Diego/San Diego Metropolitan Sewage System notify the County as early as possible when a critical limiting point is identified in their sewer systems. When such a point is identified, the County will coordinate with the affected agencies to determine whether plans to correct the deficiencies are in place or, if not, to determine whether ordinances should be enacted to restrict land use approvals in areas placing demand on these critical limiting points until facility improvements are completed and the limiting point has been eliminated. Such ordinances may utilize sewer allocation matrices, subdivision or building permit limitations, or other measures. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.4.2: Assist the efforts of sewer agencies to upgrade critical limiting points in their transmission systems and treatment facilities. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.4.3: Coordinate the establishment of easements and rights-of-way for sewer lines and roads to ensure adequate facility corridors. [DPW]

Policy 1.5: The placement of new septic systems will be controlled to ensure the health and safety of the public.

Implementation Measure 1.5.1: Utilize County regulations to avoid placement of septic systems in areas where soils are too dense or where leachate may contaminate groundwater or surface water. [DHS]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Assurance that privately-proposed wastewater treatment plants are consistent with sewer master plans and meet the anticipated needs of the project and the subregion.

Policy 2.1: The County will regulate the use of privately proposed wastewater treatment plants to ensure that they are properly located, meet the sewer needs of the project, do not cause premature urbanization, and create no unmitigable environmental effects. Availability of service from a wastewater treatment facility will not be justification for increasing densities allowed by the General Plan and zoning.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Prior to approving a specific plan, a specific plan amendment or a privately initiated discretionary land use project that includes a wastewater treatment facility, the following findings shall be made. If the facility is required for health and safety reasons, any or all of these findings may be waived if they would cause undue hardship or are not attainable.

- (a) The treated effluent is used for a productive purpose such as irrigation, industrial uses or sale to an agency for reuse.
- (b) The location and design of proposed wastewater treatment facilities will be consistent with a district's reclamation plan and engineering specifications or, in the absence of a district's reclamation plan, consistent with a Master Reclamation Plan that has been approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- (c) The wastewater facility will be operated and maintained by a public agency. If a new agency must be formed to operate the facility, the County Director of Public Works has issued a statement of technical feasibility and consistency with the master reclamation plan. The operating agency must be identified in the project application and documentation must be provided indicating that the agency has not refused to operate the proposed facility.
- (d) Both short and long range operational and maintenance costs are comparable to the cost of similar facilities in the County. The costs determined for operation, maintenance, and

facilities replacement shall be sufficient to assure fulfillment of all applicable State requirements.

- (e) A distribution system for productive use of the reclaimed water will be available. If reuse of the water is not allowed in the project region, the project may pump the reclaimed water to another area for reuse or disposal.
- (f) The facility is not located in a city sphere of influence. Additionally, construction of the proposed facility will not preclude annexation of urban and urbanizing areas to an adjacent city.
- (g) The plant design and its site does not preclude the most efficient plans for providing sewer service as identified in the reclamation plan for the entire drainage basin and provisions have been made to dedicate sufficient land to allow future operation of the facility at maximum size.
- (h) No unmitigable environmental impacts are created by the operation of the treatment facility. If surface application of reclaimed water is proposed, a preliminary determination is made in the EIR that indicates that no unmitigable impacts would occur from the surface application.
- (i) If the project proposes to increase the density or intensity of land uses allowed by the General Plan, the availability of service from a wastewater treatment facility is not used as justification for increasing densities or intensities allowed by the General Plan.

[DPLU, DPW]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Increased production and use of reclaimed water.

Policy 3.1: Water reclamation and conservation measures shall be included in the land development review process.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: For discretionary projects located within a water basin for which a water reclamation and reuse plan has been adopted, condition approval on conformance to the provisions of that plan. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Require the use of reclaimed water, where feasible, for irrigation of landscaping and golf courses, and other appropriate uses as conditions of discretionary approval. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Support the efforts of the Association of Water Reclamation Agencies in developing markets for reclaimed water, public education and legislation, and encouraging water reuse. [DPW, OSP, DPLU, AG, OIA]

Implementation Measure 3.1.4: Coordinate with special districts and other jurisdictions to develop consistent policies on the use of reclaimed water. [DPW, DPLU, DHS]

Implementation Measure 3.1.5: Provide input to the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Water Resources Control Board on plans and/or regulatory standards that would affect the ability of local agencies to use reclaimed water. [DPW]

SECTION 13.

WATER PROVISION SYSTEMS

OVERVIEW

Southern California has few rivers or other local sources of fresh water. The San Diego Region is a coastal semi-arid environment, retaining only a minimal amount of the average 9 inches per year of water from rain and snowfall. While the region's groundwater basins are adequate to meet water demand for rural development patterns and small pockets of urban development, they are insufficient to support a metropolitan population. Despite this natural handicap, a densely populated region has developed, based on an extensive distribution system of imported water.

San Diego County consumes about 200 billion gallons of water annually. About 90% of this essential liquid is brought into the region, either from the Colorado River or from sources in Northern California. The average per capita daily consumption in 1988-89 was 195 gallons and has been increasing for many years. While 55 to 60% of the use can be classified as domestic, 15 to 20% is consumed by commercial and industrial customers and 20 to 25% by agricultural users.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

FACILITY PROVISION SYSTEM

A number of different agencies share responsibility for the planning and management of the water delivery system within San Diego County. Imported water is supplied by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to the County Water Authority. The Water Authority then distributes the imported water to a number of public agencies that constitute its membership.

These agencies, including six cities and a variety of special districts, then distribute water to the ultimate consumers. About 5% of the population of the unincorporated area lives outside of the western, urbanized portion of the County, beyond the reach of the imported water distribution system. This area is shown in Figure 13-A. No imported water is available or likely to become available in the future for this portion of the region.

IMPORTED WATER SYSTEM

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Most of the water consumed in the County comes from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD member agencies are the San Diego County Water Authority, 14 cities and 12 water districts located elsewhere

FIGURE 13-A GOES HERE

in Southern California. The MWD supplies water to a territory comprising 5,200 square miles spread over six counties (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego and Ventura). More than 14.5 million people are served by the MWD.

Water supplied to San Diego County by the MWD is received by the San Diego County Water Authority and transported to cities and individual water districts for distribution to retail customers.

San Diego County Water Authority¹

The bulk of water consumed in the San Diego region is imported through Water Authority purchases from the MWD. Two primary sources supply water to the MWD: the Colorado River via the Colorado River Aqueduct and the State Water Project via the Edmund G. Brown California Aqueduct. The remainder of San Diego's water needs (approximately 10%) are met by local supplies, composed primarily of rain runoff and groundwater pumping.

Independent Water Districts Supplied by the Water Authority

In San Diego County, imported MWD water is purchased and distributed by the Water Authority to cities and a number of different independent special districts serving the western third of the County. Table 13-1 lists agencies that are members of the Water Authority. While some member agencies act as water wholesalers and supply other districts, most distribute water directly to consumers. The 25 member agencies of the Authority consist of 6 cities, 17 special districts, and the U.S. Marine Corps base at Pendleton Military Reservation. Although not a water supplier, the County of San Diego is an ex-officio member.

Special districts are established under one of a variety of different government statutes. Table 13-2 lists the various types of water districts.

Figure 13-B indicates those parts of the region served by cities or public water agencies.

IMPORTED WATER DISTRIBUTION NETWORK

Colorado River Water is diverted by the County Water Authority from the Colorado River Aqueduct into the First San Diego Aqueduct. The San Diego Canal, located a few miles west of the aqueduct, also receives Colorado River water.

¹ The County Water Authority is an entity that is completely independent of the County government. In order to make this distinction clear, the term Water Authority will be used throughout this text.

TABLE 13-1
SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY MEMBER AGENCIES IN 1990

SPECIAL DISTRICTS		
Bueno Colorado Municipal Water ¹		Ramona Municipal Water
Carlsbad Municipal Water ²		Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water
Fallbrook Public Utility ³		San Dieguito Water ⁴
Helix Water ⁴		Santa Fe Irrigation
Olivenhain Municipal Water		South Bay Irrigation
Otay Water ⁵		Vallecitos Water ⁶
Padre Dam Municipal Water		Valley Center Municipal Water
Rainbow Municipal Water		Yuima Municipal Water
FEDERAL AGENCY		
Pendleton Military Reservation ⁷		
EX-OFFICIO		
County of San Diego		
CITIES		
Del Mar	National City	Poway
Escondido	Oceanside	San Diego

¹ Solely a water wholesaler, has no facilities. Vista Irrigation District is the retail water agency.

² Formerly the Costa Real Municipal Water District.

³ In July 1990, the Deluz Heights MWD was dissolved and its territory annexed to the Fallbrook PUD.

⁴ Despite its name, organized as an Irrigation District.

⁵ Despite its name, organized as a Municipal Water District.

⁶ Formerly the San Marcos County Water District.

⁷ Although a member of the Water Authority and entitled to receive imported water, Camp Pendleton uses groundwater extensively.

FIGURE 13-B GOES HERE

TABLE 13-2
CLASSIFICATION OF WATER AGENCIES

California Water Districts: Authorized under Water Code Section 34000 et seq., these districts can acquire, plan, construct, maintain, and operate water facilities necessary for irrigation, domestic, industrial or municipal purposes, and any associated drainage or reclamation facilities.

Community Services Districts: Authorized under Government Code Section 61000 et seq., these districts have the authority to supply water, to offer sewage and storm water treatment and disposal as well as to provide any of a number of other utilities and services, not all of which are provided by each community services district.

County Water Districts: Authorized under Water Code Section 30000 et seq., these districts can perform any act necessary to furnish sufficient water in the district for any present or future beneficial use.

County Water Authority: Organized under the County Water Authority Act in 1944, the San Diego County Water Authority is an independent agency with its own Board of Directors, made up of representatives from the cities and local water districts. The Water Authority supplies water to its member agencies; it is not a direct water retailer.

Irrigation Districts: Authorized under Water Code Section 20500 et seq., these districts have the authority to control, distribute, store, spread, treat, recapture, conserve and salvage water for agriculture, domestic and industrial uses and for fire protection.

Municipal Water Districts: Authorized under Water Code Section 71000 et seq., these districts have the authority to acquire, control, distribute, store, spread, treat, reclaim, recapture, and salvage any water for use in the district. They can also provide non-water related services such as fire protection and recreation.

Mutual Water Companies: Authorized under Public Utility Code Section 2705, and Section 2725 et seq., Mutual Water Companies are defined as any private corporation or association organized to deliver water to stockholders and members at cost. They have the power to conserving, treat and reclaim water. They may also sell water to the state, school districts or other public agencies or to firefighters.

Public Utility District: Authorized under Public Utility Code Section 15501 et seq., Public Utility Districts have the authority to acquire, construct, own, operate or use facilities to supply residents with water and a broad range of other utilities including sewage treatment. Not all of these services are provided by each public utility district.

Sweetwater Authority: Authorized under Government Code Section 6500 et seq., this agency exists through a Joint Powers Agreement between the South Bay Irrigation District and the City of National City. It can jointly exercise, as an entity separate from the individual agencies, powers common to the two agencies.

Note: In addition to the powers listed above, all "urban and agricultural water suppliers" are required, under Sections 10610.4 and 1082 of the Water Code, to develop water conservation plans.

State Water Project water is delivered to the MWD at Lake Perris in Riverside County, terminus of the 444-mile California Aqueduct. From there, it flows through the Lakeview Pipeline of the MWD to the San Diego Canal where it is blended with Colorado River water. Then it flows into Lake Skinner in Riverside County just north of San Diego County. For the 1988-89 fiscal year, the MWD supplied the Water Authority with 597,118 acre-feet of water.

The MWD owns and operates the first six miles of conveyance facilities extending south from the Riverside County-San Diego County border. From there, the Water Authority takes delivery of the water. The remaining portions of the five San Diego Aqueducts are owned and operated by the Water Authority. Conveyance facilities include five pipelines in two aqueduct alignments, and are listed in Table 13-3 and shown in Figure 13-C.

The First San Diego Aqueduct runs east of Interstate 15. It contains two pipelines and ends at the San Vicente Reservoir. The Second San Diego Aqueduct consists of three pipelines, running west of I-15. One of these ends north of San Marcos, the second at the Alvarado Treatment Plant (Lake Murray) and the third extends to the Lower Otay Reservoir.

While the Water Authority does not own or operate storage facilities, it does have the contractual right to store up to 2,500 acre-feet in the Lower Otay Reservoir and 40,000 acre-feet in the City of San Diego's San Vicente Reservoir, the terminus of the First Aqueduct. Storage facilities are listed in Table 13-4.

Water supply facilities in San Diego County consist of: facilities owned by the Water Authority, including major aqueducts and pipelines; and retail member agencies' facilities including pipelines, water treatment and storage facilities (covered tanks and reservoirs). Major facilities owned by the Water Authority and individual districts, including pipelines and open reservoirs, are mapped in Figure 13-C.

Although a large number of districts obtain some water from local sources (e.g., wells), water imported through the Water Authority comprises most of their supply.

Local Storage

A few of the Water Authority member agencies have facilities for storage of local runoff and water purchased from the Water Authority. The total countywide capacity of such storage is approximately 500,000 acre-feet. However, much of this storage is available only to a relatively small number of member agencies. As of 1990, local storage facilities were not interconnected, although projects included in the Water Authority's Capital Improvement Program are intended to improve this situation. Several other member agencies have storage contracts with the Water Authority but have no storage: they use water drawn directly from the First and Second Aqueducts.

The Water Authority also has contracted for capacity rights in the San Vicente Reservoir and Lower Otay Reservoir. Table 13-4 lists the major open reservoirs in the San Diego region.

**TABLE 13-3
WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES SERVING
THE SAN DIEGO REGION IN 1990**

PIPELINE	LENGTH (Miles)	DIAMETER (Inches)
FIRST SAN DIEGO AQUEDUCT		
Pipeline 1 and Pipeline 2	65.3	48
Fallbrook-Oceanside Branch (Rainbow to Morro Reservoir)	11.5	16-14
La Mesa-Sweetwater Branch (Slaughterhouse Canyon to Sweetwater Reservoir)	16.4	29-24
SECOND SAN DIEGO AQUEDUCT		
Pipeline 3	43.8	75-66
Pipeline 4	34.2	97-72
Pipeline 5	11.0	96
Crossover Line (Twin Oaks, San Marcos to Hubbard Hill, Escondido)	7.5	66
Tri-Agencies Branch (San Marcos - Oceanside)	6.4	42-21

FIGURE 13-C GOES HERE

**TABLE 13-4
MAJOR LOCAL WATER STORAGE FACILITIES LOCATED IN
THE SAN DIEGO REGION IN 1990**

NAME	WATER RECIPIENT	TOTAL CAPACITY
Lake Barrett	City of San Diego	31,950 acre-ft.
Cuyamaca Reservoir	Helix WD	8,195 acre-ft.
Lake Dixon	City of Escondido, Vista ID	2,605 acre-ft.
El Capitan Reservoir	City of San Diego	112,805 acre-ft.
Lake Henshaw	Vista ID	53,420 acre-ft.
Lake Hodges	San Dieguito WD, Santa Fe ID	33,540 acre-ft.
Lake Jennings	Helix WD	9,790 acre-ft.
Lake Loveland	South Bay WD	25,400 acre-ft.
Lower Otay Reservoir	City of San Diego	49,510 acre-ft.
Miramar Reservoir	City of San Diego	7,200 acre-ft.
Morena Lake	City of San Diego	50,205 acre-ft.
Lake Murray	City of San Diego	4,820 acre-ft.
Lake Poway	City of Poway	3,320 acre-ft.
Lake Wohlford	City of San Diego	6,945 acre-ft.
Ramona Reservoir	City of San Diego	12,000 acre-ft.
San Dieguito Reservoir	Santa Fe ID, San Dieguito WD	1,100 acre-ft.
San Vicente Reservoir	City of San Diego	90,230 acre-ft.
Sutherland Reservoir	Ramona MWD	29,685 acre-ft.
Sweetwater Lake	South Bay ID	27,700 acre-ft.
Turner Reservoir	Valley Center MWD	1,730 acre-ft.

GROUNDWATER

Groundwater is located in aquifers below the earth's surface. This water is pumped out of the ground through wells and supplied to users either through community water systems or individual wells. Figure 13-A indicates those areas in the eastern and northeastern portions of the County that are dependent solely on groundwater.

Community Water Supply Systems

Most of the communities in the eastern and northeastern part of the County are supplied by the small, independent water districts, Community Service Districts and County Service Areas listed in Table 13-5. There are also approximately 180 small mutual or private water companies in the unincorporated area. Mutual water agencies are regulated by the State and County Health Departments. Generally these companies provide service to specific users, even as few as two or three. These individuals may be served

by a common well. In total, the mutual water companies provide approximately 10,000 to 15,000 acre-feet yearly.²

Individual Wells

The Department of Health Services issues permits and inspects the installation of approximately 850 new water wells annually in areas that are served by individual wells where no public or private water agency exists.

In addition, the County carries out groundwater management activities to ensure that discretionary projects do not result in undue extraction that exceeds long-term groundwater availability. Residential density controls and minimum parcel sizes have been used since 1979 to reduce the risk of groundwater overdraft. These controls have been applied to all discretionary applications that are subject to review by the County under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. They are based on estimates of the minimum area of land needed to collect sufficient rainfall to recharge the groundwater supply to replace that amount that is consumed. Individual projects are normally examined on a site-specific basis due to the variability of the resource.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

IMPORTED WATER

Local facility levels vary in the different districts within the Water Authority network. In general, present regional imported water facilities (e.g., Pipeline 2A which provides filtered water to those agencies located north of Escondido that are supplied by the First Aqueduct) can be considered adequate only to meet water demands until 1995. However, these facilities are run at full capacity for much of the year, with peak demand met through the use of local storage facilities. Capacity is insufficient to meet emergencies and other special conditions.

² An acre-foot is the amount of water which will cover one acre to a depth of one foot and is equivalent to approximately 325,900 gallons or 43,560 cubic feet. One million gallons equals 3.07 acre-feet. One acre-foot of water represents the average yearly needs of two families, in and around the home.

**TABLE 13-5
WATER DISTRICTS AND OTHER PUBLIC WATER AGENCIES
THAT ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE WATER AUTHORITY IN 1990**

<p>GROUNDWATER DEPENDENT AGENCIES</p> <p>Borrego Water District¹</p> <p>Borrego Springs Community Services District</p> <p>Canebrake County Water District²</p> <p>Cuyamaca Water District^{1,2}</p> <p>Descanso Community Services District</p> <p>Jacumba Community Services District</p> <p>Julian Community Services District</p> <p>Majestic Pines County Service Area³</p> <p>Questhaven Municipal Water District²</p> <p>San Luis Rey Municipal Water District^{2,4}</p> <p>Sweetwater Authority⁵</p> <p>Wynola Water District^{1,2}</p> <p>OTHER WATER AGENCIES</p> <p>Coachella Valley Water District⁶</p> <p>Lakeside Water District⁷</p> <p>Mootamai Municipal Water District⁸</p> <p>Pauma Municipal Water District⁴</p> <p>Riverview Water District^{1,7}</p> <p>Tia Juana Valley County Water District⁴</p> <p>Tri-Cities Municipal Water District⁶</p> <p>Vista Irrigation District⁹</p>
--

¹ Organized under the provisions of the California Water District Act (Section 34000 et seq. of the Water Code).

² Serves a very limited population and/or territory.

³ The Board of Supervisors acts as board of directors of CSAs and has final decision making powers.

⁴ Has no facilities, its mission is to protect rights to groundwater and/or well water and to manage water resources.

⁵ A joint powers agency of the South Bay Irrigation District and the City of National City. Obtains imported water through the Water Authority, of which the Irrigation District and National City are members.

⁶ Does not provide water to the portion of the district located in San Diego County.

⁷ Purchases water from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District, which is a member of the Water Authority.

⁸ Solely a water wholesaler.

⁹ Purchases water from the Bueno Colorado Municipal Water District, which is a member of the Water Authority.

GROUNDWATER

The County inspects approximately 80 wells, three to five times per year, for monitoring of static water levels. The program allows for the direct measurement of groundwater basins that have differing hydrologic characteristics, including the Borrego Valley aquifer and a number of mountain basins.

In general, groundwater levels have been declining at a moderate rate

(several feet per year). The County experienced a drought during most of the 1980s (1983 to 1990) with rainfall in the last two years being especially low. Prior to this (1977 to 1982) the County had six years of above-normal precipitation. In 1990, water levels throughout most of the County were at the lowest level they had been during the last 15 years as a result of this weather pattern. In addition, the same was true for the Sierra Nevada and Rocky Mountain watersheds, sources of San Diego County's imported water supply.

FUNDING METHODS

New development requires the expansion of existing infrastructure or the construction of additional facilities. In addition to the general types of funding mechanisms available for all types of facilities, there are a number of different kinds of fees that can be used to finance water transmission and treatment facilities. These include capacity charges, water consumption charges, stand-by charges and fixed meter charges. Legislation authorizing the establishment of the different types of water districts gives them the authority to impose charges and rates for services and facilities. The County has no control over the funding of facilities owned by the independent districts.

Unlike other types of public facilities, individual systems using the groundwater resource do not require public funding. Wells to produce groundwater are fully underwritten by the individual users of the resource. However, funding issues tend to arise when community water supply systems experience problems and new wells are required. In such cases the County has been able to provide little financial support. While the Majestic Pines County Service Area is managed and run by the Department of Public Works, independent Boards of Directors oversee all other groundwater-dependent agencies.

ISSUES

- 1. While the public generally assumes that ample water is available, uninterrupted supplies can never be guaranteed.**

Discussion: One of the most significant water issues facing San Diego County is that of providing long-term assurances of water availability.

Since San Diego is located in a semi-arid region, many external factors affect the availability of imported water. These factors include: failure to complete the State Water Project; the possibility that Los Angeles will require the withdrawal of more water from the same source as the San Diego region (due to population increase and/or reductions in water available from Owens Valley, its prime source); water litigation by Native Americans for additional entitlement to Colorado River water; droughts in Northern California and the Rocky Mountain States; and the annual diversion of approximately 650,000 acre-feet from Southern California due to the Central Arizona Project. Environmental concerns about the San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta may

also lead to reductions in the amount of water available for our region.

As customers at the "end of the pipeline," San Diego County is probably the region most vulnerable to water shortages along the length of the State Water Project or the Colorado River system. In times of heavy demand, drought, or breakdown of transmission lines due to earthquakes, San Diego County would be likely to experience a shortfall.

Historically, water imported from MWD has met the growing demands of San Diego water consumers. However, development of new and additional water supplies by the State and MWD may be very difficult in the future.

Agriculture is a significant user of imported water. In exchange for paying less than other customers, agricultural operations accept the possibility of interruption of water delivery in times of shortage. In 1990, after four years of drought, San Diego farmers and ranchers were faced with the possibility that the supply they depend on would be diverted to other consumers. Agriculture is dependent on imported and reclaimed water, and if it is to remain a viable operation in the County it must be assured of an adequate supply.

Each year the Water Authority purchases about 30% of the MWD's production, although it only has contractual rights to about 12%. In the event of a future shortage, the San Diego region may be entitled to a significantly lesser amount. Under a worst-case scenario, the Water Authority estimates that the San Diego region could suffer water supply shortages of 300,000 acre-feet per year, or about half of current total annual water use.

Certain MWD and state regulations dictate that in times of emergency, the MWD would distribute the water equitably among its member agencies in Southern California, thereby sharing the shortage. The City of Los Angeles has certain legal entitlements³ to a much larger portion of the water supplied by the MWD than it currently uses. Beginning in 1989, environmental and contractual constraints on its principal water sources compelled Los Angeles to significantly increase the amount of water it draws from MWD. While the MWD currently has enough water to supply the San Diego region and Los Angeles' increased needs, there is no guarantee this will continue in the future. It is likely that litigation would be necessary to resolve these conflicting provisions should the need arise.

All of Southern California is experiencing considerable population increases while the amount of water available has remained constant or declined. In order to meet this challenge, the Water Authority is working to develop a number of alternative water sources. It has established an objective of reclaiming 100,000 acre-feet of water

³ Section 135 of the Metropolitan Water District Act gives the City of Los Angeles preferential rights to as much as two-thirds of MWD water that the San Diego region imports. In contrast the Laguna Declaration, adopted by MWD in 1952, states that all clients would be served equally. In addition, Chapter 3 of the State Water Code (particularly Section 354) states that in case of an emergency, water must be allocated "...without discrimination between consumers using water for the same purpose or purposes."

annually by 2010. Interjurisdictional coordination of water and wastewater reclamation, funding for water reclamation projects and a comprehensive water management plan are strategies to be used. In order to meet future water demand, predicted to increase by 30% by 2010, the Water Authority and the water districts plan to expand distribution and storage facilities. The region can increase its supply of water to a certain extent through augmented financial expenditure. Additional water rights can be purchased, and new techniques, such as ocean water desalination, can be employed. In 1990, such sources were uncertain and/or costly and could not be depended on to provide significant amounts of water.

2. **It is difficult to ascertain how much new development can be sustained by available water since consumption will vary due to a number of factors.**

The availability of water is one of the important limiting factors in calculating the maximum population that the San Diego region could sustain. However, it would be very difficult to establish a maximum population level for the region based on water availability since many variables are involved. It is also difficult to accurately quantify the additional amounts of imported water needed to serve new residents. Consumption of water is elastic, i.e., flexible, and will vary to some extent, depending on cost and attitude toward conservation and water usage. Per-capita reductions in water consumption can be gained, for example by adding low-flow devices to interior plumbing. If such measures are required by water districts, the County, or regional agencies, water consumption would be reduced, provided that a significant proportion of users comply. Nevertheless, even perfect compliance would not necessarily guarantee sufficient water for all users in the region.

3. **As a resource, groundwater is partially renewable due to recharge from rainfall, overland stream flow and infiltration. Extended droughts can have a significant adverse impact on the resource.**

Discussion: The County of San Diego is an extremely variable hydrological region with average annual precipitation ranging from as little as 3 inches (in the desert) to more than 40 inches (Palomar Mountain). Approximately 21,000 residents of the County depend solely on the natural groundwater system, since imported water is not available in the areas of the County in which they live. Groundwater is very limited in some of these areas because of climate and limited storage capacity of the fractured crystalline rock aquifers. It is essential that planning and land use decisions take into account these geographic differences as well as the normal variations from wet to dry periods since they may create limiting factors.

4. **Although the County makes land use decisions affecting demand for water, it has only limited direct authority on the planning, operation and management of major imported water facilities in the unincorporated area. There is a need for enhanced liaison between the water agencies and the County.**

Discussion: The County approves land development projects, which typically increase the demand for water. However, under State law, the County has little input on water facilities construction projects. The Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making body for only one County Service Area and therefore has little direct jurisdiction over the planning and installation of lines or facilities. No Countywide body has decision-making powers over both water availability and land use: the County Water Authority Act specifically prohibits the Water Authority from making land use decisions.

The County's project approval and permitting process affects the demand for water facilities, while the availability of water and water facilities is a factor in the land use decision-making process. There is a need for coordination between the approval of land development projects and the provision of water supply and facilities. The long term ability of water agencies to provide sufficient water must be included in the land use decision process. Currently, availability of water service is addressed through the requirement that discretionary projects submit a service availability letter from the water agency; however, it is important to include information about overall water supply conditions as well as the capacity of existing and planned facilities to transport the water when determining appropriate land use patterns.

5. **Given the difficulty in importing additional water, there is a need to encourage water conservation and water reclamation and to develop secure water sources.**

Discussion: Two important methods to supplement the water supply are conservation and reclamation. By the middle of the 1980s, local and regional programs and policies were initiated to promote these techniques. For example, the Water Authority adopted a regional water conservation plan. In 1989, the Board of Supervisors established an extensive work program designed to promote and require enhanced water conservation and reclamation efforts.

Urban users in San Diego County consume 80% of the imported water supply. Of this amount, approximately 50% is consumed by outdoor water uses. In 1990, the County adopted measures to establish a water reclamation plan and to ensure that discretionary land development projects provide for the use of reclaimed water where feasible. Other measures include regulations requiring water conserving landscaping and low-water-use plumbing fixtures. These mechanisms will help to reduce water usage and to conserve the County's water resources.

Ultimately, water reclamation in the County can provide as much as 100,000 acre-feet each year. This represents more than one-sixth of the total existing consumption, or the outdoor needs of about 150,000 households. The reclaimed water is expected to take the place of imported water in landscape irrigation and some agricultural use. In 1990, about 2% of the total effluent from treatment plants in the San Diego region was being reclaimed and used for non-potable purposes.

There are, however, potential problems to be solved in successfully reusing water. The variation in the flow rate of raw wastewater requires the construction of storage facilities to contain excess reclaimed wastewater when a greater amount of wastewater is being produced than can be used. The second piping system needed for the distribution of treated wastewater adds further costs that would have to be addressed in order to successfully make use of wastewater.

Wastewater treatment is capable of removing many types of contaminants, and current Health Department requirements allow water reuse for most purposes except drinking. Most reclaimed water is treated to a level where only non-human contact is permitted. The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, the agencies charged with assuring that the region's surface and subsurface waters are not adversely impacted by effluent discharge, must also approve all reclamation projects. The Boards' strict regulations against the degradation of groundwater supplies with water containing high levels of salts which make the use of reclaimed water more problematic, are being reconsidered.

Extensive water reclamation requirements are less important in groundwater-dependent areas since a substantial portion of their interior water consumption is returned, on an automatic basis, to the groundwater basin through septic systems and through seepage. Some water used outside of the home (e.g., car washing, landscaping) is also returned to the groundwater basin.

6. Regional long-term capital improvements will be necessary to keep up with future demands for water.

Discussion: Growth within those parts of the County served by imported water has resulted in increased water demands. Water Authority projections indicate that demand will increase by more than 30% by 2010.

To meet this demand, a water distribution study identifying the need for expansion of regional distribution and storage facilities was prepared by the Water Authority. This study forms the basis of the Water Authority's Capital Improvement Program. In addition, the Water Authority will be developing a Water Resources Plan to outline potential sources of water to meet the region's future needs and develop those sources that are determined cost-effective.

Through its capital improvement program and other actions, the Water

Authority is striving to meet future demands for service. Between 1990 and 2010, a number of measures will be implemented, including:

- o Increasing the present aqueduct capacity by building another pipeline from the Crossover Pipeline in Twin Oaks Valley to Lower Otay Lake;
- o Obtaining additional capacity for the importing of untreated water from MWD by constructing Pipeline No. 6 leading from the Crossover Pipeline north to the delivery point;
- o Providing additional storage within the county and maximizing the use of existing storage reservoirs;
- o Expanding existing treatment plants;
- o Promoting water conservation; and
- o Encouraging water reclamation.

Funding requirements for the Water Authority's Capital Improvement Program (1988-96) have been estimated at \$530 million.

7. Additional water storage facilities are needed in San Diego County for use in periods of high demand, drought and emergency.

Discussion: Treated water is generally stored in covered water tanks while open reservoirs usually contain untreated water. Open reservoirs are generally of larger capacity and, coupled with requisite water treatment facilities downstream, are the most productive long-term solutions to storage deficiencies.

The need for additional water storage is evident. During many days throughout the year, aqueducts operate at or near full capacity. Aqueducts used by MWD to transport water to San Diego pass across the San Andreas, San Jacinto and Elsinore faults in Riverside County. An earthquake or other natural disaster could easily cut off the San Diego region from its imported water supply for weeks or even months. Any significant failure of the Water Authority delivery system in the summer would result in some agencies having to make use of stored water; supplies would be depleted within a few days. The Water Authority calculates that an additional 100,000 acre-feet of storage is needed for emergency storage. In addition to storage for emergencies and drought, additional operating storage capacity is appropriate to ease peak demands on pipeline flow.

There is a need for expansion of both local (special district) and regionwide (Water Authority and MWD) water storage facilities. To date, however, it has been extremely difficult to site and build large reservoirs due to environmental concerns. The last reservoir in the 20,000 to 30,000 acre-feet range was constructed in 1950; since then

efforts to build other major reservoirs have failed due to environmental concerns. Other potential storage methods include enlargement of existing reservoirs and the use of groundwater basins.

8. **In groundwater-dependent areas, individual users can adversely impact the water levels of others. Once excessive water is drawn from a basin, expensive deepening of wells may be necessary, or, in the most serious cases, there may be insufficient water supply to maintain existing land uses.**

Discussion: When projects are reviewed at the discretionary approval stage, typical water production rates for anticipated land uses are assumed. However, when users consistently extract water at higher levels than the anticipated rate, groundwater basins may be depleted. In certain parts of the unincorporated area some small parcels were approved 30 to 50 years ago, prior to the groundwater policy, and therefore were not subject to stringent review. If developed, these parcels could deplete the groundwater supply. Several basins have been depleted by immoderate pumping of the aquifer.

In cases where use permits are required, monitoring requirements can be imposed and production can be restrained as necessary. Lots created through the subdivision process cannot be similarly controlled on an ongoing basis unless the County takes on an additional regulatory role.

9. **Land development can cause runoff which contaminates reservoirs. Certain land uses can adversely impact the quality of water in a groundwater basin, causing serious health hazards if the groundwater is used for human consumption.**

Discussion: When rain falls on an urban area, the first-flush of runoff can pick up and transfer a considerable number of pollutants, including chemical herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, hazardous spill materials, animal droppings, gasoline and oil drippings, and litter. Sewage lines may also overflow. If the developing area is located in the watershed of a reservoir, these potentially pathogenic and carcinogenic contaminants can enter the water supply system. Such nonpoint sources of pollution had a negative impact on the Sweetwater Reservoir in the early 1980s. By the end of that decade, development with the potential for similar damage was occurring around Lake Hodges and other reservoirs.

In addition, depending on their location and design, sanitary landfill sites have the potential to negatively impact valuable groundwater basins. The Water Authority is studying the possibility of storing water underground. Four such potential groundwater storage basin sites are downstream of potential sanitary landfill sites (three are located along the San Luis Rey River and one in Camp Pendleton). A groundwater basin could be contaminated if a landfill were to leak, since toxins, acids and other pollutants could escape from a landfill and percolate

into the basin.

Contamination can spread through a complex system of aquifers and affect users located a considerable distance from the polluter. Regulating water quality is the responsibility of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County Department of Health Services. If an aquifer system or reservoir is degraded, an area could be left without a safe water supply.

10. Differing patterns of land development have differing implications for the groundwater resource.

Discussion: In order to protect environmentally sensitive lands, some land development projects propose clustering of residential units and thereby create relatively high densities. Where this occurs, fire safety concerns might necessitate such features as fire hydrants and a community water system. However, community water systems use one or few wells, rather than dispersing the demand among separate wells on individual lots. In such a case, environmental impacts can be produced by excess localized groundwater withdrawal that in the long term reduces the availability of the resource.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

ADEQUATE SUPPLIES OF WATER, APPROPRIATE FOR THE INTENDED PURPOSE, AVAILABLE TO ALL TYPES OF USERS WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.

GOAL

A SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF HIGH QUALITY GROUNDWATER TO MEET THE NEEDS OF CURRENT AND FUTURE USERS OF THE RESOURCE.

OBJECTIVE 1:

The ongoing planning, management and development of water conveyance and distribution systems to meet the county's future demands.

Policy 1.1: Land use planning, which is the responsibility of the County, will be coordinated with water system planning, which is the responsibility of the facility providers.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Establish mechanisms to work closely with the applicable water district provider during the community and subregional plan update process, and during the review of general plan amendments and rezones, to obtain their input on the impact of all proposed changes in the density or intensity of land uses on their ability to provide the service. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: In order to coordinate land use planning with planning of the water provision system:

- a) encourage the preparation of water master plans that are coordinated with the provisions of community and subregional plans.
- b) match planned build-out capacity with facilities and water that are reasonably expected to be available concurrent with need.
- c) phase development with the extension/expansion of water facilities.

[DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Furnish data to the facility providers about development planned for an area in order to encourage and support the development of water master plans, particularly for those areas of the County approaching existing water facility capacities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Support the efforts of the Water Authority and water districts to provide for storage, treatment and transmission facilities to meet demand. [DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Where feasible, encourage the siting of water facilities in the locations most suited to the needs of present and projected future residents of the locality and the region. [DPLU, CAO]

Policy 1.2: Discretionary land development projects dependent on imported water will only be approved if the service provider reasonably expects that water facilities will be available concurrent with need, and that all appropriate requirements will be met through conditions placed on project approval.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Refer projects subject to discretionary review to the appropriate water agency for recommended conditions required to extend water facilities to the project. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Require, as a basis of approval, that all discretionary projects obtain an indication from the water district that facilities are available, or are reasonably expected to be available, to serve that project concurrent with need. [DPLU]

Policy 1.3: All land development projects requiring the use of imported water shall obtain a commitment of service by the appropriate district prior to land preparation and construction.

Implementation Measure 1.3.1: Require commitment of availability of water facilities from the applicable water district before a subdivision map can record; before approval of a Certificate of Compliance in lieu of a Tentative Map, a Tentative Parcel Map or to correct a subdivision violation; before issuance of building or grading permit(s) or prior to establishing use in reliance on a Major Use Permit, or prior to occupancy or use in reliance on the permit if building and/or grading permits are not required; or a rezone that would result in an increase in density or intensity of use is approved. Such commitment must be valid for the period specified in County regulations, and may be based on existing facilities or on approved facilities under construction. The commitment may be limited based on the fact that the district also serves a city that does not require a similar commitment. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.3.2: Prior to the issuance of a permit for building or for the grading of a site in preparation for construction for any project needing hookup to a water system, require permanent commitment to serve from the applicable water district. [DPLU, DPW]

Policy 1.4: The County will coordinate with water districts and other agencies on water issues of mutual concern.

Implementation Measure 1.4.1: In conjunction with all affected land use approval and water agencies of the region, evaluate and monitor on an ongoing basis the adequacy of the regional supply of water. If deemed necessary, participate in coordinated controls to tie land use approvals to the region's supply of water. Such controls may include the allocation of water hook-ups, limitations on subdivision or building permits, or other measures, as appropriate. [DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 1.4.2: Request that districts and the Water Authority notify the County as early as possible when a critical limiting point is identified in their water systems. When such a point is identified, the County will coordinate with the affected agencies to determine whether plans to correct the deficiencies are in place, or if not, to determine whether ordinances should be enacted to restrict land use approvals in areas placing demand on these critical limiting points until facility improvements are completed and the limiting point has been eliminated. Such ordinances may utilize water allocation matrices, subdivision or building permit limitations, or other measures. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.4.3: Assist the efforts of water agencies, including the Water Authority, to upgrade critical limiting points in their transmission systems and treatment facilities. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.4.4: Coordinate the establishment of easements and rights-of-way for water lines and roads to ensure adequate facility corridors. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.4.5: Condition the approval of discretionary projects on the provision of measures to protect water reservoirs and their water sources from degradation related to the development. Such degradation may be caused by sewage spills and overflows, siltation, pollution from fertilizer, dry weather flow, first-flush storm runoff, and other identified causes. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.4.6: Work with affected fire protection agencies and water districts to cooperatively develop guidelines for appropriate water provision requirements necessary for fire protection facilities in groundwater dependent areas. [DPLU]

Policy 1.5: The County will regulate development in groundwater-dependent areas to ensure that it does not, in the long term, create a demand for groundwater that exceeds the annual recharge capability of that basin.

Implementation Measure 1.5.1: Maintain the comprehensive groundwater planning, management and monitoring system to provide

an ongoing data base for the establishment of groundwater controls.
[DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.5.2: Review land development projects on properties reliant on groundwater to ensure the availability of sufficient groundwater resources to meet anticipated demands.
[DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.5.3: Enact a County Groundwater Ordinance which establishes density controls and minimum lot sizes to serve as a guide for review of discretionary projects. Such controls will be based on estimates of the area of land needed to collect sufficient rainfall to recharge the groundwater supply to replace the amount consumed. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.5.4: Identify and map areas of the County experiencing groundwater supply and/or quality problems and apply more stringent review procedures in these areas. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.5.5: Work with existing users of groundwater systems to encourage water conservation practices on a voluntary basis and to require specific conservation measures if necessary to protect public health and safety. [DPLU, CAO]

Implementation Measure 1.5.6: Monitor the groundwater situation throughout those parts of the County solely dependent on groundwater and, where needed, adopt additional regulations governing water use and/or the approval of planning permits affecting the impacted groundwater systems. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Management of the water resource at the regional level.

Policy 2.1: The County will encourage the regional coordination of water resource management.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Through the Water Authority, cooperate with cities and special districts to establish and implement a coordinated approach to water supply and conservation in the region. [CAO]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Support the Water Authority's efforts to ensure the completion of the State Water Project and to obtain sufficient local, regional and other statewide water development facilities to meet planned need. [OIA, CAO]

Implementation Measure 2.1.3: Coordinate with the Water Authority's contingency planning for catastrophic interruption of the region's water supply due to earthquakes and other disasters.
[ODP]

OBJECTIVE 3:

A prudent balance between water availability and consumption demands.

Policy 3.1: The County will encourage the increase of storage and delivery capacity for potable water supplies, consistent with planned population growth and with planned land use patterns.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Support the development of state, regional and local facility plans to increase delivery capacity of water supplies in the County. [OIA, CAO, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Monitor and support the Water Authority's efforts to influence federal, state and regional legislative and regulatory activities that may potentially affect water supplies available to the region. [OIA, CAO, DPLU]

Policy 3.2: The County will reduce water consumption in County public facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Conserve water in all County owned and operated facilities and in all other public facility projects that require discretionary approval through the use of low consumption interior fixtures and irrigation systems, drought tolerant landscaping, and other cost-effective measures. [DGS]

Implementation Measure 3.2.2: Incorporate appropriate water conservation measures in the design of local and regional parks and recreation facilities. [DPR]

Policy 3.3: The County will promote efforts to reduce per capita water consumption.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1: Support appropriate efforts by the County Water Authority, San Diego Metropolitan Sewerage System, special districts, agricultural operations and others to increase water reclamation and conservation. [CAO, DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.3.2: Encourage and support research and demonstration projects that use non-traditional water production and conservation techniques (e.g., reclamation and desalination). [CAO]

Implementation Measure 3.3.3: Encourage water districts to adopt ordinances promoting water reclamation and conservation. [DPW]

Implementation Measure 3.3.4: Monitor new water conservation technologies for all types of land use; consider requiring such technologies through County regulations if demonstrated to be successful and feasible. Apply such requirements at the latest possible stage of the development review process in order to maximize effectiveness. [DPLU]

Policy 3.4: Water reclamation and conservation measures shall be included in the land development review process.

Implementation Measure 3.4.1: For discretionary projects located within a water basin for which a water reclamation and reuse plan has been adopted, condition approval on conformance to the provisions of that plan. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.4.2: Require the use of reclaimed water, where feasible, for irrigation of landscaping and golf courses and other appropriate uses as conditions of discretionary approval. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.4.3: Implement development regulations that require water conservation, wastewater reclamation, and drought-tolerant landscaping requirements. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.4.4: Review County land development policies and regulations for their impact on water use and conservation. Include the input of water districts during this review. [DPLU, DPW]

SECTION 14. CHILD CARE

OVERVIEW

Changes in demographics and lifestyles are making child care an increasingly critical issue for parents, children, society and our economy. Studies have identified the availability of child care as a crucial factor in improving the productivity of working parents. The San Diego County Commission on Children and Youth defines child care as: "Care for children from birth to fourteen years old by an adult other than their parent or guardian." This includes infant and pre-school child care, before and after school programs, and care for children with special needs. The three primary factors indicating the growth in demand for child care facilities are: an increase in the population of children under the age of fourteen; an increase in the number of working mothers; and changes in the composition of families, including an increase in the number of single working parents and dual income families.

While precise data are not available, the following data suggest an increased demand for child care facilities:

Nation

- o "Traditional" American families where a mother works full-time as a homemaker comprise only 10% of our nation's families. (U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 1987).
- o If current trends continue, it is projected that by 1995 two-thirds of all preschool children and three-fourths of all school-age children will have mothers in the labor force. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986).
- o Among non-working mothers in families with incomes below \$15,000, 36% stated they would seek work if reasonably priced child care were available. Among single mothers not in the labor force, 45% stated they would seek work. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982 Population Survey).

Unincorporated San Diego County and the Region

- o A 21.2% increase in the number of children in the San Diego region under the age of fourteen from 1980 to 1989. In 1989 there were an estimated 78,798 children in this age group in the unincorporated County, and 454,436 in the region. (Derived from California State Department of Finance Estimates, 1989 and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980).

- o In 1980, 17.9% of families within the unincorporated County were single parent households. This figure was 23.9% for the region. (U.S. Bureau of the Census).
- o In 1980, both mother and father worked in 23.3% of families within the region with children under eighteen. (U.S. Bureau of the Census).

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Child care facilities within the County are currently provided by private for-profit and non-profit entities, and by some school systems. Individual child care facilities usually serve only specific age groups. There are two primary types of facilities: Family Day Care Homes and Child Care Centers. Both are licensed under Title 22 regulations (State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Social Services) and administered by Community Care Licensing.

Family Day Care Homes are located in private residences, and are licensed to care for a maximum of six or twelve children. These facilities can serve children of any age, but most often serve children between the ages of birth and five years old.

Child Care Centers are larger facilities located in residential or non-residential areas. These centers are licensed to care for between 13 and 250 children. Typically these facilities serve children between the ages of two and twelve, however, they are not limited to these age groups. Child care centers are required to be licensed by the state and must meet a number of health and safety standards, for example, child-to-teacher ratio, and child-per-square-foot ratio.

Before- and after-school programs provide care for school age children. Studies prepared by the University of California School of Medicine have shown that children enrolled in before- and after-school programs are less likely to be involved with drugs and crime. The facilities for these programs are often but not exclusively provided in Child Care Centers, public schools, and recreation centers. In 1989 there were an estimated 6,465 children residing in the unincorporated areas of San Diego County who needed before- and after- school care. Many of these children currently come home daily from school to an empty house. In the unincorporated areas of San Diego County, 13 out of 30 elementary school districts have some type of before- and after-school program provided either by individual school districts or private for profit or non-profit organizations. Table 14-1 indicates those school districts where before- and after-school programs are provided in school facilities. Youth recreational facilities such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of San Diego also provide child care for some older school age children. However, these facilities are not recognized as formal care due to the fact that children may come and leave at their own will.

TABLE 14-1
SCHOOL DISTRICTS SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREA
PROVIDING FACILITIES FOR BEFORE- AND AFTER-SCHOOL CARE IN 1990

Bonsall Union	Santee
Cajon Valley Union	Solana Beach
Chula Vista City	Poway Unified
Encinitas Union	Ramona
Escondido Union	San Marcos
Lakeside Union	Vista
La Mesa/Spring Valley	

In 1989 there were an estimated 12,826 children needing affordable, accessible and quality child care in the unincorporated areas of San Diego County. Included in these numbers are those children needing before- and after-school care. These figures are estimates only, and do not take into account many of those children served in license-exempt (e.g., child care on military bases) and unlicensed care. Tables 14-2 and 14-3 show the estimated need for child care in both the region and the unincorporated area.

San Diego County has demonstrated its commitment to cost-effective and quality day care by the establishment of the San Diego County Employees Child Care Center. This center was the first county employee child care program in the country and was established through a joint cooperative effort between San Diego County and its employees. The San Diego County Board of Supervisors initially appropriated start-up costs for this center and continues its support through a low-cost lease.

FUNDING METHODS

For many child care facilities, construction and start-up costs are funded through private ventures; however, there are alternative funding options for some child care providers. Some of the sources available for facility financing are: Federal and State grants, foundation grants, partnerships between private sector employers and child care providers, and Mello-Roos Community Facility Districts.

GRANTS

Federal and State grant programs are available on a limited basis to non-profit child care providers. Federal grants can be used for start-up costs for future child care facilities and the renovation of existing structures. Currently, Federal and State grants are used primarily for subsidizing the costs of child care for parents and, to a limited extent, to fund program operations and maintenance, rather than for establishing child care facilities. Existing Federal grants for funding child care facilities include Community

Development Block Grants. Federal grants are distributed through the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children,

TABLE 14-2
1989 ESTIMATED DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE SPACES
IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA AND THE SAN DIEGO REGION

UNINCORPORATED AREA

	INFANT/PRESCHOOL AGE (0-4 YEARS)	SCHOOL AGE (5-13 YEARS)	TOTAL
Child Population, 1989 ¹	28,912	49,886	78,798
Projected No. of Children with Working Mothers ²	11,565	26,938	38,503
Projected No. of Children with Working Mothers Needing Formal Child Care ³	6,361	6,465	12,826

SAN DIEGO REGION

	INFANT/PRESCHOOL AGE (0-4 YEARS)	SCHOOL AGE (5-13 YEARS)	TOTAL
Child Population, 1989 ¹	181,837	272,599	454,436
Projected No. of Children with Working Mothers ²	72,735	147,204	219,939
Projected No. of Children with Working Mothers Needing Formal Child Care ³	40,004	35,329	75,333

¹ *State of California, Department of Finance, 1989 Population Estimates.*

² *California average of children aged 0-4 with working mothers if 40%. California average of children aged 5-13 with working mothers if 54%. State of California, Department of Finance, Office of Population Research, 1988.*

³ *National average of children aged 0-4 with working mothers, where children are placed in formal care is 55%. National average of children aged 5-13 with working mothers, where the children are placed in formal care is 24%. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Who's Minding the Children? 1984-5.*

TABLE 14-3
1989 ESTIMATED SUPPLY OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES
IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION¹

	INFANT/PRESCHOOL AND SCHOOL AGE (0-13 YEARS)
Projected No. of Children with Working Mothers Needing Formal Child Care ²	75,333
Total No. of Licensed Child Care Spaces (Including Before and After School Care) ³	59,878
Estimated Deficiency in the No. of Licensed Child Care Spaces	15,455

¹ *Figures for the number of child care spaces in the unincorporated area are not available.*

² *See Table 15-2.*

³ *License exempt care and unlicensed care are not included in these figures.*

Youth, and Families; and the Department of Education. State grants are currently available for special populations and facility expansion. However, State grants are not available for facility start-up nor for operation and maintenance costs.

FOUNDATIONS

Private foundations provide various grants for the funding of child care programs and facilities. Each foundation grant specifies the approved uses and any limitations on use.

PRIVATE SECTOR

An increasing number of private sector employers are entering into joint partnerships with child care providers to establish child care facilities for their employees. One example is when the employer finances the costs of establishing a child care facility. The facility is then administered by a licensed child care provider that supplies child care services for employees of the organization providing the initial funding.

MELLO-ROOS COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICT

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act, Government Code Section 53311 et seq., permits the formation of a special financing district to fund the purchase,

construction, expansion, improvement or rehabilitation of child care facilities. The district may also fund child care insurance costs. Community Facilities Districts may be implemented in an area upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the residents or property owners.

ISSUES

- 1. The high costs of establishing and maintaining a child care facility are a major factor inhibiting the provision of sufficient child care facilities.**

Discussion: Obstacles that providers encounter in establishing child care facilities are: financing start-up costs, locating affordable spaces to lease or buy, ongoing operation and maintenance costs, inadequate labor pool, and high child care insurance costs. Due to these limitations many proposed child care centers are never opened, and many that are opened are not situated in the most optimal location or do not have economical rates. Government funding to help finance or renovate non-profit child care centers has decreased substantially in recent years, creating an additional impediment to the establishment of affordable child care facilities.

- 2. Lack of uniformity of the zoning and planning process within the region in relation to proposed child care facilities poses difficulties for child care providers.**

Discussion: Child care providers are faced with different zoning and planning policies for the County and for each city within the San Diego region. This creates ambiguity as to the specific criteria that must be met to establish a child care facility. The San Diego Association of Governments is considering coordinating with the County and the region's 18 cities to examine their zoning and planning processes in relation to child care facilities. The goal would be to provide consistency among all jurisdictions.

- 3. There are insufficient facilities currently available for school-age children.**

Discussion: One of the most prominent child care needs is the provision of facilities for before- and after-school care. There are approximately 35,329 children in the San Diego region needing this type of care. Currently 13 out of the 30 school districts serving the unincorporated areas of the County provide before- and after-school programs; however, many school districts do not have such facilities. These school facilities provide a valuable service in supervising children who might otherwise be left unattended.

- 4. Inadequate facilities for infants, children with handicapping conditions, and**

mildly ill children.

Discussion: Many of the existing child care facilities cannot serve children with handicapping conditions, or children who are mildly ill (e.g., colds and flu). These children must be cared for in special facilities, which are usually very expensive and scarce in supply. In 1989 there were no facilities within the unincorporated area to serve mildly ill children, and only one facility to serve handicapped children. Child care facilities for infants are inadequate due to the limited number of child care providers willing to furnish this type of service because of higher insurance costs and a high child-to-teacher ratio mandated by the State.

5. Increasing child care needs are created by demographic changes and by new development.

Discussion: Demographic changes such as the increase in working mothers and the changing composition of families are the main factors contributing to the increased need for child care facilities. Population and job opportunities created from new residential and commercial development add to the number of children in need of child care facilities. Demand is increasing faster than supply.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

AFFORDABLE, ACCESSIBLE AND AVAILABLE CHILD CARE FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Child care facilities appropriately located near the workplace, home and schools.

Policy 1.1: The County will encourage the siting of child care facilities compatible with community needs, land use and character, and encourage such facilities to be available, accessible, and affordable for all economic levels.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Support research on the feasibility of locating child care centers at "Park and Ride" sites, transit centers or other locations accessible to public transportation. [CCC]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Advocate the inclusion of child care facilities in both the planning of new school facilities, and plans for the expansion or improvements of existing school facilities. [CCC]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Investigate the feasibility of siting before- and after-school programs in parks located near schools. [CCC, DPR]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Acceptance by state, county and city agencies of the need for child care facilities.

Policy 2.1: The County will actively encourage the provision of child care facilities.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Where feasible, make underutilized County properties or low-cost loans available to child care providers, particularly for those child care facility types of greatest need. [CAO, CCC]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Review the zoning ordinance to simplify the procedures for land use permits for child care centers. [DPLU, CCC]

Policy 2.2: The County will work with other jurisdictions within the region to simplify the zoning and planning process in relation to child care facilities, in particular Family Day Care Homes.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Cooperate with the San Diego Association of Governments and the region's cities to draft a model ordinance or procedure for the processing of permits for child care facilities. [DPLU, CCC]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Work with the region's cities to develop uniform zoning policies regarding location, parking and other requirements. [DPLU, CCC]

Policy 2.3: The County will encourage the State and Federal government to stimulate the provision of child care facilities.

Implementation Measure 2.3.1: Support legislation that would assist in the provision of quality child care facilities. [OIA, CCC]

Implementation Measure 2.3.2: Encourage governmental agencies to expand educational child care facilities e.g., Headstart and before- and

after-school programs. [CCC]

Policy 2.4: The County will establish cooperative partnerships with child care providers to help facilitate the availability of child care.

Implementation Measure 2.4.1: Provide a "checklist" to child care providers on physical standards for construction of child care facilities. [DPLU, CCC]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Establish the role that new development plays in the demand for child care, and the role it should play in the supply of child care facilities.

Policy 3.1: The County will work to ensure that child care facilities are available when needed by new development.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Develop a formula for use in assessing the child care needs created by new development. [DPLU, CCC]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Investigate the feasibility of requiring applicants for projects for major residential, commercial, and industrial developments to use the developed formula to assess the demand for child care facilities created by the development, and to mitigate these needs. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.3: Investigate a program to grant a bonus in density or intensity of use for commercial, industrial, and residential projects that provide child care facilities. [DPLU, CCC]

SECTION 15. COURTS AND JAILS

OVERVIEW

Courts and detention facilities are critical components of the justice system. The County, as an agent of the State, is mandated by the State Constitution and State laws to provide adequate court space and detention facilities. The courts, while located and functioning in each county, are part of the State judicial system. Responsibility for the provision of detention facilities is determined by length of confinement, with County facilities handling offenders with terms of twelve months or less, and State facilities housing offenders with longer terms. Federal facilities handle those arraigned or charged with federal offenses (e.g., income tax evasion, drug trafficking, illegal entry). County courts initially process all cases other than federal offenses.

Law enforcement activities and prosecution must be matched by sufficient facilities and services for the adjudication and detention of those convicted of crimes to effectively protect lives and property, and to ensure a safe and peaceful community.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The County of San Diego, acting as an agent of the State, is responsible for providing Court and Detention facilities for the entire region. Eight agencies directly staff and support Court and Detention facilities: the Superior Court, the Municipal Court Districts, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, Revenue and Recovery, the Marshal, the Sheriff's Department and the Probation Department.

DETENTION FACILITIES

Currently there are 13 County-operated detention facilities located in the region, with a rated capacity in 1990¹ of 3,352 beds. Six jails are operated by the Sheriff, and seven minimum security and juvenile facilities are operated by the Chief Probation Officer. Probation facilities include four honor camps, two boys camps, Juvenile Hall and a Work Furlough Center. Each facility and its capacity in 1990¹ is shown in Table 15-1. The locations of these facilities are shown in Figure 15-A.

¹ Figures are for January 1, 1990.

TABLE 15-1
COUNTY OPERATED DETENTION FACILITIES IN 1990

FACILITY	LOCATION	RATED BEDS	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
Central	San Diego	730	Sheriff
Vista	Vista	517	Sheriff
Las Colinas Men's and Women's	Santee	560	Sheriff
Descanso	Descanso	225	Sheriff
South Bay	Chula Vista	192	Sheriff
El Cajon	El Cajon	120	Sheriff
Camp Barrett	Alpine	144	Probation
Camp La Cima	Julian	80	Probation
Camp Morena	Campo	80	Probation
Camp Westfork	Warner Springs	139	Probation
Work Furlough Center	San Diego	126	Probation
Juvenile Hall & Girl's Rehabilitation Facility	San Diego	239	Probation
Probation Boys Camp	Campo	200	Probation
TOTAL BEDS		3,352	

FIGURE 15-A GOES HERE

COURT FACILITIES

In 1989, County courtrooms and hearing rooms were provided in 10 facilities throughout the County. These facilities typically house both Superior Court and Municipal Court functions. A total of 128 courtrooms and hearing rooms were available in 1989. Court facilities include not only courtrooms but also space for court-related functions such as the judges' chambers, clerical areas and the District Attorney's office. Table 15-2 lists the locations of these facilities and the available courtrooms.

Municipal Courts have original jurisdiction over all misdemeanors, infractions, traffic offenses, civil cases involving less than \$25,000, and small claims cases. Municipal Court judges also preside over preliminary hearings in felony cases, and some Superior Court matters (e.g., sentencing of felons). The San Diego region is divided into four municipal judicial districts: El Cajon, North County, San Diego, and South Bay.

The Superior Court has jurisdiction over all felony cases, civil cases over \$25,000, cases involving title and possession of real property, dissolution of marriages, child custody, probate, mental health, and juvenile proceedings.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Existing facilities for both detention and courts are severely overcrowded. In FY 1988-89, San Diego adult detention facilities had a State of California rated capacity for 2,347 inmates, but held 4,968 inmates, or 190% of capacity. Because of the jail overcrowding, San Diego has also utilized a number of alternatives to incarceration. The overall incarceration rate is 19.3 per 10,000 population. This is well below the statewide average of 22.9 per 10,000 population.

There is an existing deficiency of 28 courtrooms comprised of substandard courtrooms and existing budgeted judicial positions lacking courtrooms. In general, courtroom space not designed or altered to serve as a courtroom is considered substandard. Usually such rooms have insufficient or poorly organized space, poor security, acoustical problems and lack of spectator/jury seating. Modular facilities and the San Diego Hotel are considered substandard.

FUNDING METHODS

STATE FUNDING

Some of the construction costs for court and jail facilities have been provided in the past through State Jail Bond funding. Surcharges on parking and non-parking fines and forfeitures authorized by the County Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction

Fund (Government Code Section 76004) and the County Courthouse Temporary Facility Construction Fund (Government Code Section 76000) generate additional revenues for capital projects, including expansion and repair of existing facilities.

**TABLE 15-2
FACILITIES CONTAINING COUNTY OPERATED
COURTROOMS/HEARING ROOMS IN 1989¹**

FACILITY	NUMBER OF COURTROOMS/HEARING ROOMS		
	SUPERIOR	MUNICIPAL	TOTAL
Downtown	34	25	59
Clairemont Mesa Traffic	0	4	4
North County Regional Center	11	9	20
Escondido	0	2	2
East County Regional Center	2	11	13
John Burnham Building	7	0	7
Juvenile Court	8	0	8
San Diego Hotel	5	0	5
South Bay Regional Center	0	8	8
San Marcos Traffic/Small Claims	0	2	2
Total	67	61	128

¹ The County of San Diego plans to add or will have added a number of permanent and temporary courtrooms in the next several years. These include 9 at the El Cortez Hotel, 3 at the North County Regional Center (including 2 relocatables), 2 relocatables at Juvenile Hall, 4 at the East County Regional Center, and 4 at the South Bay Regional Center.

GENERAL FUNDS

Historically, a portion of the General Fund increase from one year to the next has gone to fund court and jail operations, however, these funds have not been sufficient to cover facilities costs.

SALES TAX

In June 1988 the Regional Justice Facility Financing Agency was approved by the County's voters. The voters authorized a limited purpose special district to impose a 1/2 percent sales tax for a period of 10 years. Funds generated by this sales tax increase are to be used for capital facilities, with up to 25% authorized to be used for operations and maintenance. Since approval by the electorate, this sales tax has been collected, however, a pending lawsuit challenging the validity of the tax has prevented the funds from being spent. This source is expected to generate \$1.6 billion over a ten year period for courts, jails and other justice-related facilities (excluding enforcement). However, the total need for new justice system capital facilities and operations exceeds even the available sales tax revenue. For the ten year life of the sales tax, estimated capital and operating costs exceed revenue by approximately \$500 million.

ISSUES

1. Existing facilities are severely overcrowded and new facilities are needed.

Discussion: Existing facilities are insufficient to house the current number of inmates. In addition, the number of inmates in San Diego detention facilities is expected to continue to increase at an annual rate of 12.9%. It is projected that by the year 2010 there will be 41,937 adult inmates requiring detention facilities in San Diego County. As of January 1, 1990, the adult detention facilities had a permanent rated bed capacity of 2,591. In order to house the projected increase in inmate population, it is estimated that an additional 39,356 beds will be required. In addition, there will be a projected juvenile population of between 6,000 and 7,500 juveniles requiring as many as 250 additional beds by the year 2010.

It is projected that the County will need approximately 200 additional courtrooms by the year 2000. The projections of future judicial position requirements are based upon the assumption that the historical relationship between workload and population growth will continue in the future for each court.

2. Cost sharing is needed for facilities that serve the entire region.

Discussion: Courts and jails are provided by the County to serve the entire region's population. The need for these facilities is generated by regional demands. Costs for these facilities are only partially covered by state and local revenue sources, and the County General Fund will have insufficient revenue to fully fund all new justice system capital and operational costs. An equitable regional formula is needed for sharing the costs of new Court and jail facilities and of major renovations of existing facilities that serve the entire region.

A cost-sharing mechanism between the County and cities should equitably allocate the responsibilities for acquiring, expanding and maintaining court and jail facilities. This could include direct transfers from cities' general funds, use of tax increment financing within city redevelopment project areas, a redistribution of existing revenues between cities and the County, and/or support for County legislative proposals. Effective January 1, 1991, the Legislature authorized California counties to charge cities a booking fee for each arrestee brought to the County's jail.

3. Court and jail facilities are often difficult to site.

Discussion: Courtrooms and some detention facilities (e.g., pre-trial facilities) are most appropriately located close to the population served. In many cases, this means that such facilities are best sited within the boundaries of cities. Regardless of location, these facilities serve the population of the entire region. While in most cases the County is not subject to city zoning and building regulations, or the requirement to obtain city permits, it is desirable to coordinate with cities on the siting of court and jail facilities in the most appropriate locations to serve the region's population. However, time delays and potential opposition of the residents of the affected city or community can add time and expense to the siting of these facilities. A cooperative mechanism including all jurisdictions is needed to jointly plan, when possible, the siting of court and jail facilities.

4. New development contributes to the need for new court and jail facilities.

Discussion: A portion of the need for new court and jail facilities is created by new development, both in the unincorporated area and the cities. Both inmates and arrests have increased sharply in the last five years. This is partly due to population growth, and partly due to changes in state law and criminal procedures requiring longer sentences and making more offenses subject to arrest and incarceration. Since a portion of the need for new court and jail facilities is attributable to population growth, a regional development impact fee could be

used to require new development to contribute its fair share toward financing new facilities. In order to guarantee equity, all new development in the region, not only in the unincorporated area, would be required to contribute.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

ADEQUATE COURTROOM AND DETENTION FACILITIES TO SUPPORT THE COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

OBJECTIVE 1:

An equitable method of funding for justice facilities by all jurisdictions and by all new development that will benefit from the facilities.

Policy 1.1: The County will seek regional cooperation on appropriate requirements for new development throughout the County to contribute its fair share of funding for County court and jail facilities related to the needs of the new development.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Determine the relationship between new growth and the need for County court and jail facilities. [CAO, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Establish the legal and technical basis for a regionwide development impact fee, and seek regionwide implementation. [DPLU, CAO]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Timely siting of County justice facilities in the most appropriate location to serve the region's population, irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries.

Policy 2.1: The County will coordinate with all jurisdictions within the region at the earliest possible point in the planning process to cooperatively develop plans for the siting of justice facilities which best serve the needs of the entire region.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Establish a cooperative process among land use jurisdictions to ensure that County justice facilities are sited in locations that best serve the region's population irrespective of jurisdictional

boundaries, while considering city and County general plans and community standards. [CAO, DPLU, DGS]

SECTION 16.

SOCIAL SERVICES

OVERVIEW

Social service programs assist the indigent, disabled and elderly. They provide a safety net of last resort through services to assist individuals and families to escape from or remain out of poverty, and to stay or become self-sustaining. A number of services are provided to special groups such as the blind, abused children and refugees. Social service programs are mandated by State and Federal statutes and regulations and are largely funded from Federal and State sources.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Social Service facilities and programs for residents of the entire San Diego region, including both the unincorporated areas and cities, are provided by the Department of Social Services. Social Services facilities are widely distributed within the County, but are located primarily in urban areas in order to best serve their clients. These facilities house a number of programs that supply eligible individuals with vital resources in the form of cash, food stamps or coupons and medical coverage. The Department also administers programs that enable individuals to achieve greater personal security, productivity and self-sufficiency. These programs include:

- o Adult Services (5 facilities: 2 shared with Employment Services, 3 shared with Childrens Services) -- provides in-home supportive services and adult protective and conservatorship services.
- o Childrens Services (9 facilities: 3 shared with Adult Services, 2 shared with Income Maintenance) -- investigates referrals of suspected child abuse or neglect, provides emergency shelter care for children, in-home supervision or out-of-home placement services for children, and licensing for Foster Home and Day Care services.
- o Employment Services (10 facilities: 2 shared with Adult Services, 2 shared with Income Maintenance) -- provides education services in specialized centers, employment preparation and training, work experience and work incentives for indigent persons receiving income supplements.
- o Income Maintenance (12 facilities: 2 shared with Childrens Protective Services, 2 shared with Employment Services) -- provides financial assistance to eligible children, families and disabled, homeless, or indigent persons; provides food stamp coupons and Medi-Cal cards; provides funds to families with children lacking support of either parent, and payments to foster homes and institutions to care for children who have been placed out of their own homes.

Social Services administers programs in a total of 31 facilities: 23 leased and 8 County owned. Figure 16-A shows the geographic location of the

facilities by type of service. Many of the facilities house compatible programs which benefit from joint siting. Due to the number of cross-referrals among County programs, social services are often located with or near other County facilities.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Some social service facilities are overcrowded and in urgent need of renovation, replacement or modernization. A 1989 study by the Department of Social Services indicates that the space now provided does not meet present space guidelines and that there is a general need for upgrading and enlargement of facilities in order to provide adequate services to the public.

FUNDING METHODS

Most current funding for social service facilities and programs comes from Federal/State sources for mandated programs. These sources often require matching funds of between 25 and 50%. County discretionary funds provide matching funds for the programs. Funding for Social Services facilities comes through the State Department of Social Welfare Administrative Claim. This claiming process documents San Diego County expenditures associated with operating Federal and State mandated and optional programs. Many of the revenue sources require County matching funds. In total, facilities expenditures are approximately seventy-five percent revenue-offset.

ISSUES

- 1. Existing facilities do not provide sufficient space for an adequate level of service.**

Discussion: The number of clients receiving social services is rapidly increasing despite relatively low levels of unemployment and robust economic growth in the San Diego region. This is due in part to the increasing numbers of single-parent families in our society, secondary migration, the increasing number of homeless individuals, and the impact of undocumented immigrants. Many of these individuals are not counted in the unemployment statistics. This increase in case load creates a need for new facilities without corresponding increases in public awareness of the need and without increases in the required levels of funding. A process for systematically upgrading facilities to keep pace with increases in demand is needed.

FIGURE 17-A GOES HERE

2. Multijurisdictional involvement in the siting of County social service facilities is necessary.

Discussion: Many social service facilities are most appropriately sited within the boundaries of cities. However, regardless of location, these facilities serve the population of the entire region, including residents of cities. While the County is not subject to city zoning and building regulations or the requirement to obtain city permits, it is desirable to coordinate with cities on the siting of County facilities within their jurisdiction. However, time delays and potential opposition from host jurisdictions can create problems in siting County facilities in the most appropriate locations to serve the region's rapidly expanding population.

Social service facilities are best located close to the population being served; however, negative perceptions of the impact of these facilities can lead to community resistance. A cooperative mechanism is needed to include local jurisdictions and communities in the planning and siting of social service facilities.

3. Cost sharing for facilities that serve the entire region.

Discussion: The need for County social service facilities is generated by regional demands. Costs of facilities serving the entire region are only partially covered by State, Federal or local sources. Additionally, because of the claiming process used for social services funding, which relies on reimbursement, up-front funding to purchase facilities is typically not available. An equitable regional method is needed for sharing the costs of new social services facilities and of major renovations of those facilities that meet the needs of the entire region.

4. Co-location of social services programs is difficult.

Discussion: Co-locating functions to provide "one stop" service may be desirable for the convenience of clients and for operating efficiency. While not all social service programs are compatible or suitable to be housed in the same facility, some co-locations have been highly successful when the programs serve the same clientele. For example, Employment Program staff have been co-located in the Income Maintenance offices in several areas.

County Social Services are not the only programs available and desirable for co-location. Staff from the Employment Development Department and Childcare Resource Service have been co-located in Employment Services offices. Another successful site sharing has been to house the special adult learning centers in the same facility as the GAIN Employment Program. The co-location of compatible programs is being considered for expansion due to the increasing interaction and development of mutual

services between the various school districts and Social Services. Maximizing the co-location of compatible programs needs to be considered when developing social service facilities.

5. **A model for determining adequate facility levels for social services is lacking.**

Discussion: Social service programs required to meet the needs of society are so numerous, varied and complex that it is difficult to formulate an overall standard for the need for facilities. Facility needs vary by program, and are directly related to the population served and the type of service provided. For example, Adult Services facilities, because they serve elderly and disabled adults, require special handicapped accommodations and interview rooms, whereas Childrens Services facilities require observation rooms, play areas for children, and residential facilities. Formulation of guidelines that integrate the entire County social service provision system is needed.

6. **A demonstrable link between new development and the need for social service facilities has not been established.**

Discussion: The need for social service facilities for various programs is caused by a complex variety of factors. As the region grows there is a larger population of potential users of social service facilities. However, there has been insufficient study to date to demonstrate a clear link between the land development process and the need for additional social service facilities.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL
ADEQUATE SOCIAL SERVICE FACILITIES TO PROVIDE MANDATED ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS FOR ELIGIBLE RESIDENTS OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Adequate social service facilities conveniently located to all San Diego County residents in need of such facilities.

Policy 1.1: Siting of new facilities and expansion of existing social services facilities will be planned to most effectively serve the clients of each social service activity as part of a comprehensive

social service delivery system.

Implementation Method 1.1.1: Use existing studies and new data to develop a model to guide planning for placement and expansion of social services facilities. This model will integrate all required social services and facilities into a County-wide system which:

- a) specifies required units of each type of service per population or service demand unit,
- b) relates demographics and service requirements to criteria for the type and size of facilities needed in a given area,
- c) provides for maximum flexibility in the use of facilities for co-siting services and response to changing patterns of social service needs, and
- d) includes an appropriate mix of County-owned, leased, and contracted facilities.

[DSS]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Develop facility standards for long range social services planning. [DSS, CAO]

Policy 1.2: The County will improve the present condition and quantity of social service facilities to achieve incremental improvements designated in a plan.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Use existing and new studies to identify priorities for addressing inadequacies in social service facilities by type of service, demographics and geographic area. Prepare a short-term capital improvement plan to remedy these existing deficiencies. [DSS]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Seek funding sources to carry out facility improvements in phases, as revenues become available. [DSS]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Siting of Social Services facilities in the most appropriate location to serve the region's population.

Policy 2.1: Planning for the appropriate siting of County social service facilities will be coordinated with the cities of the region at the earliest possible point in the siting process.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Establish a cooperative process among land use jurisdictions to assure that County social service facilities are sited in locations that best serve the region's population irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries while considering local and County general plans and community standards. [DSS, CAO]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Ensure that adopted planning guidelines do not negatively impact the appropriate siting of County social service facilities, and request the same of cities. [DPLU, DSS]

Policy 2.2: The County will work with other service providers to seek joint siting of compatible facilities.

Implementation Measure 2.2.1: Seek the cooperation of other jurisdictions, including school districts, in joint siting of compatible programs and joint use of facilities to provide services to mutual clients. [DSS]

Implementation Measure 2.2.2: Contact other agencies when seeking sites for social services facilities to determine if space is available in facilities housing compatible programs. [DSS, DGS]

Policy 2.3: Social Service facilities will be sited in the most appropriate location irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries.

Implementation Measure 2.3.1: Consider the following factors in siting Social Service facilities: convenience to potential clients, adequacy of transportation and parking at facilities, potential for co-siting services, acceptability to the affected community, safety of staff and clients and ease of referral to frequently used services. [DSS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Equitable funding of new social service facilities.

Policy 3.1: The impact of new development on the need for County social service facilities shall be mitigated.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Determine the relationship between new growth and the need for County social service facilities. [DSS, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 3.1.2: Seek regional cooperation on appropriate requirements for new development throughout the County to contribute its fair share of funding for County social service facilities related to the needs of the new development. [CAO, DSS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 4;

Assure that social service facilities are included in land use plans at the earliest possible stage to minimize conflicts with surrounding land uses.

Policy 4.1: County land use planning for the unincorporated area shall be coordinated with planning for social service facilities.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Work cooperatively with community planning groups to establish "candidate" sites for social service facilities, especially during comprehensive community plan updates. [DPLU, DSS]

SECTION 17. HEALTH

OVERVIEW

County health care programs protect and improve the health of San Diego County residents. Many programs are mandated by federal and state law, while others are developed locally to meet local health needs. Health care facilities house programs that prevent disease and health risks, treat existing disease, provide supportive environments in which individuals may address their problems, and mitigate conditions which are hazardous to health. Programs carried out from or in these facilities include a wide range of activities such as immunizations, mental health treatment, drug and alcohol problems direct services, nutrition education, AIDS testing, restaurant kitchen inspection and toxic spills response.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Health facilities and programs for residents of the entire San Diego region, including both the unincorporated areas and cities, are provided by the County Department of Health Services. Some of these programs are staffed by the County and offered in facilities that are either owned or leased by the County. Other programs are located in facilities that are provided through contracts with private and non-profit agencies. Due to the number of cross-referrals among County programs, health services are often located with or near to other County facilities or school facilities. Figure 17-A shows the geographic location of the facilities by type of service.

Health Services facilities house a number of programs, including:

- o Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services (2 facilities owned and 1 leased by County and 55 contracted facilities) -- assists persons and communities with alcohol problems, provides drug abuse prevention, education, and treatment service (outpatient, residential, group, family and individual counseling, and social model detoxification).
- o Environmental Health Services (6 facilities owned or lease purchase and 1 leased by County) -- protects the population from disease, illness, and economic loss that can result from environmental health hazards including unsafe food, polluted water, substandard housing, unsafe recreational facilities, excessive noise, improperly managed hazardous materials, disease bearing vectors, and overexposure to ionizing radiation.
- o Mental Health Services (7 facilities owned and 8 leased by County, 40 contracted facilities) -- provides a range of mental health treatment, prevention and education

programs to those who are unable to receive such services from the private sector. Services include crisis intervention, acute inpatient, outpatient, day treatment, case management, long-term

FIGURE 17-A GOES HERE

residential, patient advocacy, services to the justice system, social and vocational rehabilitation, and services to students who are seriously emotionally disturbed or have other handicapping conditions.

- o Physical Health Services (4 facilities owned and 2 leased by County, 76 contracted facilities) -- provides certification of the County's emergency medical services system, emergency and urgently needed medical services for indigent adults, operation of Edgemoor Geriatric Hospital (a 323 bed rehabilitation and heavy care facility), primary care services for the working poor, health services for newly legalized residents, and medical services to inmates of County detention facilities.
- o Public Health Services (8 facilities owned and 3 leased by County) -- is responsible for enforcement of all State statutes, regulations of various cities, and County ordinances to protect the public health in San Diego County. Services include maternal and child health care, community disease control, epidemiology, AIDS testing, public health nursing, public health education, public health laboratory services, veterinarian services, and acting as the State Statutory agent for vital records (birth and death) in San Diego County.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Some facilities that are owned or leased by the County are overcrowded and in urgent need of renovation, replacement, or modernization. County Health facilities generally have not been well maintained, and capacity has not been increased sufficiently to meet the demands imposed by an underserved and growing population. For Public Health facilities, significant problems exist. For example, the structures of the Public Health Centers are thirty years of age, in poor condition, and inadequate in terms of space due to the growth in patient flow and clinic activity. Anticipated increases in patient flow and clinic activity raises the risk of a loss of certification for service programs. Although overcrowded, no mental health facilities are known to be at risk of not meeting accreditation or licensing standards.

FUNDING METHODS

Facilities for health programs are generally funded through the State and federal programs that provide funds for the programs themselves. For programs provided in facilities owned by the County or leased, the General Fund also bears a portion of the facilities' costs. For programs provided by contractors in their own facilities, the cost of facilities are included in the costs passed on to the County.

ISSUES

1. Facilities are overcrowded and lack adequate maintenance.

Discussion: The County has generally lacked funds to do maintenance at the necessary level and to construct new facilities in a timely fashion. This has resulted in operational difficulties and difficulty in maintaining accreditation or certification by State and Federal agencies. Because of dramatic growth in the County's population, a significant shortage of adequate space exists, estimated in 1990 at 9,000 square feet for each of the seven of the eight Public Health Centers deemed inadequate. This shortage could be corrected through additional funding.

2. A model for determining the facility levels for all health facilities is lacking.

Discussion: Health programs are so numerous, varied and complex that it is difficult to formulate an overall standard for the need for facilities. Facility needs vary greatly by program type. Currently, mental health facilities are required to meet certain facility standards. Such standards are not established for other types of health facilities.

3. The need for new health facilities for various programs is caused by a complex variety of factors.

Discussion: As the region grows, there is a larger population of potential users of County health facilities. In some areas, there has been insufficient study to date to demonstrate a clear link between the land development process and the need for additional health facilities. However, several studies have concluded that there is consistency in the prevalence of the chronically mentally ill within the general population at approximately one percent. Based on this conclusion, an increase in population is likely to result in a proportional increase in the number of mentally ill who would potentially use County mental health facilities. It is probable that the demand for other types of health facilities are similarly higher based on the growth of the region's population; however additional studies are needed before such findings can be made.

4. Multijurisdictional involvement in the siting of County health facilities is needed.

Discussion: Many County health facilities are most appropriately located within the boundaries of cities. Regardless of location these facilities serve the population of the entire region, including residents of cities and the unincorporated

area. While the County is not subject to city zoning and building regulations or the requirement to obtain city permits, it is desirable to coordinate with cities on the siting of County facilities within their jurisdiction. In those cases where the County applies for city permits, time delays and potential opposition from affected jurisdictions can create problems in siting County facilities in the most appropriate locations for serving the region's rapidly expanding population.

Residents of smaller, local communities frequently object to siting of County health facilities in their neighborhoods. Such objections are particularly likely for AIDS, mental health, drug, and alcohol facilities. A mechanism including all jurisdictions and participation by local communities is needed to jointly plan the siting of health facilities.

5. Cost sharing for facilities that serve the entire region should be developed.

Discussion: The need for County health facilities is generated by regional service demands. Costs for facilities serving the entire region are not fully offset by State, Federal or local funding sources. Regional methods are needed to cover the costs of health facilities that serve the entire region.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

FACILITIES THAT MEET THE HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF ALL ELIGIBLE COUNTY RESIDENTS.

OBJECTIVE 1:

A general health services facility planning model to guide decision making on levels and placement of health facilities.

Policy 1.1: The County will develop a general model to determine requirements, and guide planning for placement and expansion of publicly funded health facilities to most effectively serve the clients of each health care activity as part of a comprehensive health care delivery system.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Use existing studies and new data to create

a model that integrates all required publicly funded health services and facilities into a County-wide system which:

- a) specifies required units of each type of service per population or service-demand unit,
- b) relates demographics and service requirements to criteria for the type and size of facilities needed in a given area,
- c) provides for maximum flexibility in the use of facilities for co-siting services and response to changing patterns of health needs and,
- d) includes an appropriate mix of County owned, leased, and contracted facilities.

[CAO, DGS, DHS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Health facility levels which better meet the needs of eligible County residents.

Policy 2.1: The County will improve the present condition and quantity of publicly funded health care facilities to achieve incremental improvements designated in a plan.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Use existing and new studies to identify priorities for addressing the need for health facilities by type of service, demographics and geographic area. Prepare a short-term capital improvement plan to remedy these existing deficiencies. [DHS, CAO, DGS]

Implementation Measure 2.1.2: Seek funding sources to carry out facility improvements in phases, as revenue becomes available. [DHS, DGS]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Siting of Health Service facilities in the most appropriate location to serve the region's population.

Policy 3.1: The County will coordinate planning for the appropriate siting of County health facilities with the cities of the region at the earliest possible point in the siting process.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Establish a cooperative process among land use jurisdictions to assure that County health facilities are sited in locations that best serve the region's population irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries, while considering city general plans and community standards. [DPLU, DGS, CAO, DHS]

Policy 3.2: The County will work with other service providers to seek joint use of facilities.

Implementation Measure 3.2.1: Contact other agencies when seeking sites for health services to determine if space is available in facilities housing compatible programs. [DHS]

Policy 3.3: Health Service facilities will be sited in the most appropriate location based on developed criteria.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1: In siting Health Service facilities, consideration shall be given to convenience to potential clients, adequacy of public and private transportation and parking at facilities, potential for co-siting facilities, acceptability to the host community, safety of staff and clients, and ease of referral to frequently used services. These criteria should be applied irrespective of city/county jurisdictional boundaries. [DGS, CAO, DHS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Mitigation of the impacts of new growth on the need for County health facilities.

Policy 4.1.1: The County will seek regional cooperation on appropriate requirements for new development throughout the County to contribute its fair share of funding for County health care facilities related to the needs of the new development.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Determine the relationship between new growth and the need for County health facilities. [DPLU, DHS]

Implementation Measure 4.1.2: Establish the legal and technical basis for a regionwide development impact fee, and seek regionwide implementation. [DPLU, DHS]

OBJECTIVE 5:

Health facilities will be coordinated with land use plans at the earliest possible stage to minimize conflicts with surrounding land uses.

Policy 5.1: The County will coordinate land use planning for the unincorporated area with planning for health facilities.

Implementation Measure 5.1.1: Work cooperatively with community planning groups to establish appropriate sites for health facilities in advance of need, especially during comprehensive community plan updates. [DPLU, DGS, DHS]

SECTION 18.

SENIOR SERVICES

OVERVIEW

Services to seniors are increasingly important as the proportion of the population which is over sixty increases. Between 1980 and 1989 there was a 23.4% increase in the total population of the County. During this same time period, the population over 60 years of age increased by 37.3%. By 1990, the number of seniors, defined as those 60 years of age or older, is estimated to reach 389,761. The needs of seniors differ from those of younger persons, and are best addressed by programs designed specifically for these special needs. Examples of problems more common for seniors include limited mobility, reduced income, and health problems. The provision of programs for seniors is mandated and largely funded by the Federal and State governments.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In March, 1970, the County Office of Senior Citizens Affairs was established in response to Federal and State mandates. With the 1973 amendments to the Older Americans Act (1965), this Office was designated by the State as the Area Agency on Aging (AAA). Since 1983 the AAA has been a separate County department serving the entire region, including cities, with the goals of securing maximum independence for older Americans, preventing unnecessary institutionalization, reducing isolation and loneliness, improving nutrition and health and assisting those seniors who are, due to infirmities, vulnerable to abuse and exploitation.

Facilities provided through contracts with the Area Agency on Aging house programs that are targeted specifically to the needs of persons sixty years of age or older. With some exceptions, these facilities are provided throughout the County through contracts with public and private non-profit organizations using facilities owned or leased by these organizations. Nutrition and other services are provided in a variety of locations, e.g., senior centers, churches and other community service facilities. Figures 18-A and 18-B show the location of facilities used by the Area Agency on Aging. Although emphasis is given to those in the greatest need, many services are available to all seniors. These services include:

- o Adult Day Care (in 12 facilities) -- provides programs addressing the specialized needs of the frail elderly and functionally impaired adults.
- o Case Management and other Services (in facility leased by Area Agency on Aging) -- provides assistance to frail seniors to remain safely in the community and to avoid institutionalization; education, information and referral services; employment assistance; case management which contracts for direct in-home services such as homemaking and personal care; and investigation and resolution of complaints about long-term care facilities through the Ombudsman program.

FIGURE 19-A GOES HERE

FIGURE 19-B GOES HERE

- o Nutrition Services (at 61 contracted sites, and home delivery) -- provides home delivery and congregate settings for meals, provision of transportation, and technical assistance to providers from registered dietitians.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Facility levels in 1990 were adequate to house the programs at the level they are currently funded. In the event that program operations increases, the County will need to pursue funding to expand the current facilities to accommodate the additional programs.

FUNDING METHODS

The majority of funding for senior services facilities has, in the past, come from the Federal and State governments, and from sources other than general tax revenues. The County General Fund currently supports some senior service programs, but does not fund facilities.

STATE FUNDING

The California Senior Center Bond Act (1984) provided funding to construct or renovate a number of Senior Centers within the County. These low interest loans, matched by funds provided by local governments and some non-profit corporations, permitted construction of or improvements in 19 Senior Centers in which the County provides programs for seniors through contracts with public and private non-profit organizations. All funds from this source have been distributed, however, legislation pending in 1990 may provide future funds.

ISSUES

1. New funding sources for facilities are needed.

Discussion: The current method of providing facilities is an indirect one, through contracts for services in facilities owned or leased by the contracting agencies. Many of these facilities were constructed through use of the recently completed California Senior Center Bond Act (1984). All funding from this Act has been expended, and alternative funding sources will be needed to extend facilities such as Senior Centers to areas of the County undergoing development.

2. Multijurisdictional participation in the provision of senior service facilities is necessary.

Discussion: Senior services are provided on a regional basis, crossing city and county jurisdictional boundaries. The City of San Diego currently partially funds nutrition services at eight sites. Other, smaller cities received Senior Center Bond Act grants and provided sites for AAA nutrition programs. Planning and funding on a regional basis will be needed to ensure continuation of adequate facilities for senior service programs.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

FACILITIES ADEQUATE TO PERFORM MANDATED SERVICES FOR SENIORS.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Regional planning and funding of an adequate level of senior service facilities.

Policy 1.1: The needs for senior service facilities shall be addressed on a regional basis.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Site senior service facilities in locations close to the service population, transportation, and other compatible uses. [DGS, AAA]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Coordinate the planning and funding of senior service facilities with the cities of the region. [DGS, AAA, CAO]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Actively support legislation that would provide additional funding for senior service programs and facilities. [OIA, AAA]

Policy 1.2: The County will coordinate land use planning for the unincorporated area with planning for senior service facilities.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Work cooperatively with community planning groups to establish appropriate sites for senior service facilities in advance of need, especially during comprehensive plan updates. [DPLU, DGS, AAA]

SECTION 19. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

OVERVIEW

County administrative facilities house a wide range of general office and support activities that are essential to the operation of County programs. Functions provided in general County facilities include centralized administrative and support functions for all County agencies and policy and management of County programs and operations.

Administrative and support functions include facility maintenance and security, fiscal management, record keeping, communications, personnel, and legal services. Policy and management functions include the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The County owns, leases, manages and utilizes a wide variety of facilities for administrative functions. Typically such facilities are shared by more than one organization. Table 19-1 shows the organizations that are included in this section, the facilities that they utilize, and whether these facilities are owned or leased. Figure 19-A gives the locations of the major facilities that house these organizations.

The County Administration Center (CAC) and the County Operations Center (COC) are the primary facilities for general County Administration. Other buildings are used for administrative offices which, due to space constraints, cannot be accommodated in the CAC or COC. Certain support functions are more suitably located in facilities closer to the programs which they support, such as road stations, while some functions best serve the public through "outreach" satellite offices that are convenient to clients.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

Major facilities such as the County Administration Center, County Operations Center and the County Operations Center Annex are aging, crowded and in need of expansion or repair. Present facilities do not meet adopted space guidelines. Plans are underway to mitigate some of these problems.

FUNDING METHODS

The facilities covered in this section are funded primarily by the County General Fund. However, some services such as planning and permit processing generate fees, and

other services are supported by grants which may be used for capital improvements to serve those programs.

TABLE 19-1
LOCATIONS OF COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT FUNCTIONS IN 1990

ORGANIZATION	CAC	COC	COC ANNE X	MILLS BLDG.	CRC	OTHER
Assessor	O				S	L
Auditor and Controller	O	O				O
Board of Supervisors	O				E,NA	L
Chief Administrative Officer	O	O				
Civil Service Commission	O					
Clerk of the Board	O					
County Counsel	O					L
Equal Opportunity Mgt.	O					
General Services	O	O	O		E,N,S	O,L
Grand Jury						L
Human Resources	O	O				L
Information Services	O	O				O
Intergovernmental Affairs	O					
Purchasing	O	O				
Revenue and Recovery				L	E,N,S	
Treasurer and Tax Collector	O					

CODES:

O= owned, L = leased

CAC = County Administration Center (owned), COC = County Operations Center (owned)

COC ANNEX = 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego (owned)

MILLS BLDG = 1255 Imperial Avenue, San Diego (leased)

CRC - County Regional Centers

E = East County Regional Center located in El Cajon

N = North County Regional Center located in Vista

NA = North County Regional Center Annex located in Vista

S = South County Regional Center located in Chula Vista



FIGURE 19-1 GOES HERE

FIGURE 19-A GOES HERE

ISSUES

1. **There is no formula for determining the space needs for County administrative facilities as it relates to the extent of the programs being provided by the County.**

Discussion: Space in facilities is allocated according to the number and types of persons and equipment that will be housed. However, there is no standard relationship between administrative space needs and the level and type of services provided by the county.

2. **Existing County support facilities are crowded, and related functions are not all located in the same vicinity.**

Discussion: Due to space constraints, all related County programs are not located together, causing inefficiencies in some program operations.

3. **There is no established relationship between the need for administrative and support facilities and regional growth.**

Discussion: As development proceeds, new or expanded facilities for carrying out certain programs can be funded by new development through impact fees. However, there is currently no methodology for determining whether additional administrative and support facilities will be needed to serve a larger population.

4. **As the region grows, the demand for Countywide services increases; yet there are constraints to the expansion of building and parking areas in central County facilities.**

Discussion: Many County administrative functions housed in central County facilities are regularly used by taxpayers, businesses, and citizens who are involved with County government for a variety of reasons. To be responsive to public needs, County functions must be accessible to citizens of the entire region. However, the County Administration Center and the County Operations Center have constraints on their expansion, creating continuing logistic difficulties in meeting the increasing use demands of the public. It may be necessary in the future to relocate some of the direct service functions to alternative spaces.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

FACILITIES SUFFICIENT TO MEET COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Efficient and effective planning and siting of County administrative facilities.

Policy 1.1: The County will seek to provide adequate space in which to perform County functions, assure convenient public access, maximize efficiency of County operations, and minimize County costs.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Establish a policy for locating facilities on a central, regional, and/or local basis, and for determining which functions should be co-located. [CAO, DGS, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Project long-term programmatic needs and population forecasts to develop a plan for future acquisition of space to house County administrative programs. [CAO, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Select locations for County facilities which are convenient to the public via public transportation; located near compatible public programs, whether operated by the County or other government agencies; and which are cost-effective. [CAO, DGS, DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Provision of facilities adequate to meet County program needs within the County's budget constraints.

Policy 2.1: The County will seek to improve administrative facilities starting with the highest priority needs.

Implementation Method 2.1.1: Implement an incremental program for improvement and/or replacement of existing County general administrative facilities. [CAO, DGS]

OBJECTIVE 3:

Equitable funding of County administrative facilities serving the entire region.

Policy 3.1: The County will seek appropriate support for funding administrative facilities from other benefitting parties.

Implementation Measure 3.1.1: Ensure that County programs that are funded by grants, contracts, and user fees include the full cost of facilities acquisitions and maintenance as part of the overhead costs for performing those functions. [ALL]

OBJECTIVE 4:

Provision of County administrative facilities to meet the growing needs of the public and support of County programs.

Policy 4.1: The County will expand and improve County facilities to meet growing needs.

Implementation Measure 4.1.1: Apply modern technologies such as office automation and telecommunications, where and when feasible, to maximize the effective use of space in County facilities. [CAO, DIS]

Implementation Measure 4.1.2: Develop a plan to expand the County's space for administrative facilities that is responsive to the growing needs and the available resources. [CAO, DGS]

Implementation Measure 4.1.3: Consolidate the location of interrelated County programs to assure that County facilities promote efficient functioning and communication. [CAO, DGS]

Implementation Measure 4.1.4: Support the objectives of other governmental programs and policies, within the limits of budgetary constraints, by voluntarily complying with programmatic goals such as water conservation, energy conservation, design, and traffic management programs, in the construction and operation of County facilities. [DGS, CAO]

SECTION 20.

FACILITIES LOCATED WITHIN CITY SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

OVERVIEW

Coordination among the County, cities, and special districts is essential for the efficient provision of capital facilities throughout the region. The areas comprising the spheres of influence of cities present a critical coordination need because it is anticipated that responsibility for local services and facilities within these areas will shift from the County (and in many cases from special districts) to cities within the next fifteen years.

Spheres of influence are approved by the Local Agency Formation Commission pursuant to Government Code Section 56425 et seq. In the San Diego region, spheres of influence are territories that are expected to annex to a designated city within the next ten to fifteen years. The ultimate service areas of cities and other jurisdictions have not been officially designated by LAFCo; however, some cities have established a "sphere of planning interest" exceeding their approved spheres.

The San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission also approves spheres of influence for special districts. The Commission generally establishes a "zero" sphere of influence for special districts within territories contained in city spheres where it is anticipated that the city will take over those responsibilities upon annexation. However, there are cases where a special district is expected to continue to provide service to an area upon annexation to a city.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In 1990, there were eighteen cities within San Diego County. All except Imperial Beach have spheres of influence adopted by the Local Agency Formation Commission. Ten cities have spheres of influence with developable territory beyond their present boundaries (Chula Vista, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Marcos, and Vista). Sphere territories include "unincorporated island" territories that are geographically isolated from other unincorporated areas, i.e., islands or pockets of unincorporated territory that are not proximate to most of the unincorporated area. There are also several special study areas which adjoin one or more cities and for which a sphere determination has not been made. The largest unincorporated city spheres are for Chula Vista and Escondido. Statistics on sphere sizes are constantly changing as cities and their spheres expand.

Sphere areas are on the outskirts of their cities. The core of the respective cities generally serve as the cultural and activity centers for their sphere territories. Frequently the sphere territories are less intensively developed than surrounding territory within the city. In some cases, the city is the most logical jurisdiction to extend essential facilities such as sewer service into the sphere areas, which ensures that annexation to the city precedes intensive development in spheres. In other

cases, special districts and the County have the ability to provide the facilities needed to support new growth. In either case, until annexation to a city does occur, the County has land use responsibility for the sphere of influence territories.

EXISTING FACILITY LEVELS

The availability of public facilities in sphere areas varies. Some facilities such as library, flood control, and animal control are provided by the County to serve the entire unincorporated area. In some cases the facilities which serve sphere territories are located within the city to which the territory will eventually be annexing. Other facilities such as those used for fire protection, sewer, and water are provided by special districts in some city spheres but similar services are not available in others.

FUNDING METHODS

Funding methods for County-provided and district-provided facilities within city spheres are the same as those available Countywide. However, unique opportunities exist in sphere areas to supplement these revenue sources with potential funding support from the respective cities. To the extent that the city provides facilities for its own residents that can meet the needs of the sphere territories, equitable funding arrangements can be made to ensure that sphere territories benefit from city facilities and pay a fair share to attain those benefits. Along the same lines, residents in cities benefitting from capital improvements located in sphere territories can share in the cost of those facilities located in the unincorporated area. The city's capital improvement plans can be expanded to include the city's anticipated responsibility for future improvements in the sphere territories.

ISSUES

1. City annexations may adversely impact special districts.

Discussion: Special districts may be adversely impacted by city annexations. As special districts lose territory, their facilities may no longer be optimally located to serve the changing physical dimensions of the district. Similarly, when special districts' service areas diminish, the financial ability of the districts to continue to keep facilities operating to serve a smaller area may be jeopardized. Planning to ensure the optimal utilization of public facilities and an orderly transition of service responsibilities can offset some of the negative impacts of city annexations on special districts.

2. Different standards in cities and the County may create difficulties.

Discussion: When the County uses a different standard for construction of facilities than a city does, it can cause problems for the city upon annexation. The city may incur substantial capital improvement needs by accepting territory with infrastructure built to a lower standard. It is similarly difficult for a city to accept a higher capital improvement level established by the County, such as location of branch libraries in a city's sphere if that city does not operate branch libraries or location of a facility that duplicates a nearby city facility.

3. Potential equity questions arise through the use of differing standards.

Discussion: Establishing developer requirements at different levels in a city and its sphere areas is inequitable if the sphere areas are using (or are projected to use in the future) the same city facilities. Since a sphere territory will be undergoing service transition in the future, a determination is needed as to whether it is more appropriate for new development to pay for its fair share of facilities currently serving the project or those in the city which are expected to be providing service within the life of the project.

4. County islands are difficult for the County to serve.

Discussion: Unincorporated areas which are substantially surrounded by cities cannot be effectively served from County facilities. Access is through a city's transportation system, and city facilities are inevitably closer to the island areas than County facilities.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL

COORDINATION BETWEEN THE COUNTY AND CITIES TO ENSURE AN ORDERLY AND EFFICIENT TRANSITION FROM UNINCORPORATED AREA TO CITY STATUS.

OBJECTIVE 1:

Facilities available to serve sphere territories at the same level as those available to city residents, with a plan for an orderly transition of responsibilities when annexation occurs.

Policy 1.1: The County will coordinate with cities to cooperatively

develop facility standards, plans for facility siting, and funding methods for capital facilities throughout the cities' sphere areas which are consistent with the facility plans within the cities. Whenever feasible, a city's ultimate physical boundaries shall be considered in these plans.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1: Seek agreement with each city having a sphere of influence or areas of common interest on facility standards, facility levels to be attained within the sphere territory, financing methods, and development project review procedures. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.2: Establish general city-county joint facility review procedures that can be readily accomplished with all cities without substantial additional cost to the County. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.3: Develop joint facility siting and financing plans, and special district transition plans, with cities that are willing to commit resources to a cooperative work effort. [DPLU, DPW]

Implementation Measure 1.1.4: Site facilities in the most suitable location, recognizing the facility plans and service area boundaries of the future providers of service in city sphere areas, and ensure that they are compatible with both the County General Plan and the affected City General Plan. [ALL]

Implementation Measure 1.1.5: Develop a procedure whereby developer-constructed facilities in city sphere areas will be required to be built to the mutually agreed upon standards and specifications for each sphere territory. [DPW, DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.6: To the extent that joint planning review will benefit the cities and County, establish procedures that can be administered by cities to the maximum extent permissible. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.1.7: Encourage the establishment of a transition plan between the district(s) and city describing anticipated service area boundary shifts, joint planning for facility locations to plan for future needs of both agencies, and possible mutual funding agreements. Such transition plans should be equitable to both entities and recognize the advantages of a cooperative approach based on local service arrangements. These plans should be maintained as conditions change. [DPLU]

Policy 1.2: The County will facilitate the orderly annexation of appropriate territory to cities and plan facilities in remaining County territory consistent with potential future government structures.

Implementation Measure 1.2.1: Encourage the Local Agency Formation Commission to keep city spheres updated to include territory which is likely to be annexed within ten to fifteen years. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.2: Designate potential incorporations and rural communities and consider those areas as units for facility planning purposes. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.3: Encourage the annexation of "unincorporated islands" to cities, and require applicants for discretionary land development projects located in "unincorporated islands" to annex to cities when city facilities are more appropriately situated to serve the property. [DPLU]

Implementation Measure 1.2.4: Require annexation to a city for all discretionary projects in which city facilities can serve the project and County facilities cannot effectively or efficiently serve the project. [DPLU]

OBJECTIVE 2:

Equitable funding of facility costs at the established facility levels.

Policy 2.1: New development shall be required to pay its fair share contribution toward the capital facility needs created by the project.

Implementation Measure 2.1.1: Establish development impact fees for public facilities for each sphere territory in cooperation with the affected city. [DPLU, DPW]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Brian, "The Power of Water", San Diego Magazine, May 1990.

Bloom, David E., "Why Child Care is Good for Business", American Demographics, August 1988.

County of Broward (FL), Comprehensive Plan, Adopted March 1, 1989.

County of Orange, Environmental Management Agency, Advance Planning Division, Component II, Advance Planning Program, Public Services and Facilities Element, January 9, 1985.

County of Riverside, Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, Amended through December 22, 1987.

County of Sacramento, The Sacramento County General Plan, Adopted July 29, 1982.

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy A-106, Water Supply and Conservation, Adopted June 10, 1986, Revised December 3, 1986.

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy G-10, Water Conservation, Adopted May 26, 1982.

County of San Diego, Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Services, Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal in the San Diego Region, January 1990.

County of San Diego. Long Range Library Financing Task Force, County of San Diego, Long Range Library Financing Task Force Report, December 28, 1989.

County of San Diego, Office of Supervisor George Bailey, Fire and Emergency Services in San Diego County, December 1988.

County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation, Parks, Wildlife and Open Space Issues for 1990, October 11, 1989.

County of San Diego, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, Revised 1986.

County of San Diego, Financing Options For Roads, Flood Control, Fire Protection, and Sewer Facilities, February 1982.

County of San Diego, Public Road Standards, January 1985.

County of San Diego, Report of the Public Facilities Task Force, Financing Capital Facilities in the 1980's, December 1982.

County of Santa Clara, General Plan - Santa Clara County, Amended through March 1982.

Granito, John, "Evaluation and Planning of Public Fire Protection", Fire Protection Handbook, 16th edition, Edited by Arthur E. Cote, Quincy, Massachusetts: National Fire Protection Association, 1986.

Lancaster, Roger A., ed. Recreation, Park and Open Space Standards and Guidelines, Alexandria, Virginia: National Recreation and Park Association, 1983.

Metropolitan Transit Development Board in cooperation with San Diego Association of Governments and the Metropolitan Transit System Operators, Metropolitan San Diego Short Range Transit Plan 1990-1994, June 1989.

Montgomery, James M., Consulting Engineers, Inc. for the City of San Diego, CA, Framework Plan Report for Modifications to the Metropolitan Sewerage System, July 1989.

North County Transit District, Short Range Transit Plan 1990-1994, June 1989.

Office of Planning and Research, Paying the Piper: New Ways to Pay for Public Infrastructure in California, Sacramento, CA: State of California, 1982.

Pryde, Philip R., ed., San Diego: An Introduction to the Region, 2nd edition. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1984.

Regional Growth and Planning Review Task Force, Fiscal Impact of Growth, San Diego, 1988.

Regional Growth and Planning Review Task Force, Growth Management Implementation Work Program, San Diego, 1989.

Regional Growth and Planning Review Task Force, Growth Management In the San Diego Region, San Diego, 1988.

Rosenhan, A. K., "Fire Department Apparatus, Equipment and Facilities", Fire Protection Handbook, 16th edition, Edited by Arthur E. Cote, Quincy, Massachusetts: National Fire Protection Association, 1986.

Sacramento, City of, Recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Child Care, October 1885.

San Diego Association of Governments, Aviation Facilities Inventory, 1983, May 1984.

San Diego Association of Governments, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan, June 1989.
San Diego County Water Authority, Fact Sheet: San Diego County Water Authority

Capital Improvement Program, (no date).

San Diego County Water Authority, Forty-Second Annual Report of Authority Operations for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1988, San Diego, 1988.

San Diego County Water Authority, H2O - Our Formula For San Diego's Future, May 1988.

San Diego County Water Authority, San Diego Area Water Reuse Study, Volume 1 - Overview Report, September 1987.

San Diego County Water Authority, Water Talk, Vol. 2, #2, #3, #4 (1989) Vol. 3, #1 (1990).

San Diego County Water Authority, 1989-90 Adopted Budget.

State of California. Department of Education. School Facilities Planning Division. School Site Selection and Approval Guide. Sacramento, 1989.

State of California. Department of Finance. Population Estimates. 1988.

State of California. Department of Finance. Population Estimates. 1989.

State of California. Office of Planning and Research. General Plan Guidelines. Sacramento, 1987.

Stover, Vergil G. and Koepke, Frank J. Institute of Transportation Engineers. Transportation and Land Development, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1988.

United States Bureau of the Census. Who's Minding the Children?, 1984-1985.